

ENC FILE 0321

①

**AD-A210 462**

# **VOLUNTEERING FOR EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS**

**FINAL REPORT**

**FOR**

**FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY  
WASHINGTON D.C., 20472**

**FEMA COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT NUMBER: EMW-K-1024  
WORK UNIT: 4851B**

**DTIC**  
**ELECTE**  
**JUL 25 1989**  
**S B D**  
*Ob*

**MAY 1989**

**APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED**

**89 7 25 058**

Executive Summary  
Volunteering For Emergency Preparedness

by  
Jiri Nehnevajsa

FEMA COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT NUMBER: EMW-K-1024  
WORK UNIT: 4851B

for

Federal Emergency Management Agency  
Washington D.C., 20472

"This report has been reviewed in the  
Federal Emergency Management Agency  
and approved for publication. Approval  
does not signify that the contents  
necessarily reflect the views and  
policies of the Federal Emergency  
Management Agency."

University Center for Social & Urban Research  
1706 Cathedral of Learning  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15620

May 1989

Approved for public release: distribution unlimited

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This brief report focuses on some salient aspects of voluntary participation of people in activities and programs relevant to emergency management. This report represents an elaboration of Some Issues in Emergency Management: Public Views 1987.

The study involved a national phone sample of 1,595 respondents in the 48 contiguous states of the Union. The rather long survey instrument was divided into two parts. Upon completion of the first part, respondents were given the options to continue or not, or to make arrangements to be contacted at another time. Of the 1,595 respondents, 1,398 (87.6 percent) were willing to respond to more questions, and most continued at the time of the interview. The difference in sample bases, then, of 1,595 and 1,398, is, as necessary, indicated throughout.

Three types of variables are explored in this stage of analysis. First, respondents rate the idea, or "concept," of "self-help" at the local level of emergency management. Second, respondents address their willingness to volunteer. And third, respondents address their willingness to receive training that would sustain or enhance coping skills and knowledge of emergency preparedness and management.

In regard to the self-help concept, findings show that respondents indicate a more positive attitude toward self help activities the more favorably they evaluate both local and Federal Government efforts in emergency and disaster management. Respondents who indicated previous volunteer experience show a slightly higher positive rating of the self help concept than do respondents reporting no volunteer work in the preceding 12 months. In comparing expressed attitudes toward self help with responses on "willingness to volunteer," the survey shows no essential differences in attitudes toward self help between those indicating a willingness to volunteer (rating self help with an index of 62.9, with a possible maximum value of 100), and those unsure about their willingness to volunteer (rating self help with an index of 59.0), and those indicating unwillingness to volunteer (rating self help with an index of 58.3). This suggests that while the willingness to volunteer produces slightly higher favorability ratings of self help, people consider the self help concept important regardless of whether or not they consider themselves as volunteers.

On willingness to volunteer, the results show that some 75.7 percent of the respondents expressed their willingness to engage in voluntary activities, and another 8.7 percent indicated that they are unsure. The survey also shows that chances are about equal that both prior volunteers and non-volunteers would participate in emergency management activities, including training. The resulting pool of possible volunteers would be comprised of about one-third people who have previously been volunteers, those who might concurrently participate in other types of volunteer activity, and two-thirds those who have not been involved in voluntary work, at least not in the preceding 12 months. Among prior volunteers, the more time per month they reported as having spent in voluntary activity, during the preceding year, the more time they predict they would invest.

The prospects for mobilization of volunteers that the study indicates do not apply to appeals other than direct and personal ones, that is, mass messages through radio, television or newspapers.

There are several major conclusions drawn from the data on respondents' expressed willingness to receive training. People with some prior disaster and emergency related training are more likely to have served as volunteers than people without such training. These previously trained respondents are also more inclined to become volunteers for preparedness programs in their communities than are people without prior training experiences.

Overall, there is high willingness to receive training. However, previously trained people express a higher rate of willingness to update their skills, (more than 80 percent), as compared to those respondents who have never received training (68 percent). Also, people trained in the past ten years are substantially more likely to claim their intentions to become retrained than are people whose training experience dates back beyond the past decade; and this holds regardless of whether the previous training involved health-related or war-related or other types of training involvements. These data suggest the hypothesis that the more recent the training experience the higher the willingness to be retrained.

This study makes a distinction between volunteer activity at the community level, that is, institutionalized forms of emergency management, and self-help activity involving the household, or at the private level. Related to levels of training, most respondents are oriented to volunteer activities at the community level. A small grouping express a willingness to train, and/or retrain, but do not express a willingness to volunteer for community programs. Therefore, these respondents are apparently oriented to the household level, or private level of self-help.

Analysis of a variety of socio-cultural and demographic characteristics is performed to reveal any bearing these may have on respondents' attitudes and behavior regarding volunteer activity. The principal finding is that there exists robust homogeneity in the population. This indicates that despite slight variations, there is a national consensus on expressed willingness to receive training, as well as to work in community programs, and that self-help is a "very good" idea. This consensus also holds true for the finding that the perceived effectiveness of community disaster and emergency programs is rated higher than that of Federal programs.

All of the background traits, except one - labor union membership - show slight variations in responses to the survey. For example, women slightly more than men are inclined to volunteer and rate the self-help concept slightly higher. The same holds true, respectively for higher income versus lower income, young versus old, single and married respondents versus divorced, separated and widowed respondents. Other demographics examined are race, household size, education, and religion.

The data were also analyzed in terms of geographic areas: counties and administrative regions. Numerical indices computed for these groupings indicate no

significant variations with respect to favorability ratings of the items surveyed, for example, ratings of Federal versus local emergency and disaster program effectiveness, and willingness to participate. In both geographic categorizations Federal programs received lower favorability ratings, with respect to effectiveness, than did local, community programs. In addition, the following variations are noted.

Respondents of the "middle" categories of county size, those with 50,000 to 250,000, and 250,000 to one million populations, show slightly higher favorability ratings for local programs than do the lower and higher population size categories. The two most populous groups of counties gave somewhat higher ratings to Federal programs than did the less populous counties. On the item "Volunteering Claims and Intentions," there are somewhat more claims of volunteering in the twelve months prior to the survey in the most and least populated counties, and the willingness to participate in training programs is reported as slightly higher in the two categories of counties with the largest populations. Yet the willingness to work as volunteers is somewhat higher in the least populous counties.

The ten administrative regions of FEMA, when compared to county ratings, show less variation in their favorability ratings of Federal programs when compared to their assessments of local activities. National averages for the FEMA regions were computed for this item, "views on community and Federal program effectiveness," as well as for the following variables: "perceived effectiveness of self-help," "previous year's volunteering reports," and "training and volunteering willingness."

Region X, which includes data from Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, excluding Alaska, shows the highest indices in rating the effectiveness of both community and Federal programs. Region I, the New England states, shows the (relatively) lowest indices. With respect to evaluation of the self-help concept, the "perceived effectiveness of self-help" index shows, again, Region X with the highest rating; Regions VI and II, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, respectively, show the next highest indices; while Region III, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia shows the lowest, but still high, rating.

Region X and Region VIII, Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming, report the highest percentages of voluntary activities in the twelve months prior to the survey. Region IV, the Southern states, shows a significantly lower rate of voluntary activity in the preceding twelve months. With respect to willingness to train, and willingness to volunteer, Region VIII reports nine out of ten respondents are willing to participate in training programs, while only seven out of ten, the lowest percentage across all regions, report a willingness to volunteer in emergency and disaster programs.

National averages were computed for all indices of the variables measured. The indices for Region X, across all variables, exceeded the national averages. Those willing to volunteer for local programs in Regions II and VIII are also above the national averages. Region VII, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Region V, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan,

Ohio, Wisconsin, show less than the national average on the indices of perceived self-help, willingness to train, and willingness to volunteer.

The invariably high ratings of the self-help concept found in this study suggest that public policies encouraging volunteering stand a very good chance of success. A minimum of governmental involvement is indicated to initiate and provide the impetus for self-help programs at the local level, as well as to provide technical assistance and continued guidance of such self-help groups. This conclusion is based on the fact that there is no evidence to suggest that self-help programs would be initiated spontaneously, although, once begun, may well mushroom and persist in a spontaneous mode.

The study indicates that in contrast to a lack of volunteers, public policy would have to be directed towards managing a possible abundance of volunteers. Also, an abundance of those willing to receive training raises the issue of which training programs would be best utilized: those that concentrate on acquisition of elementary emergency and disaster skills, such as first aid, or those that enhance and upgrade skills already in place. In addition, it is not clear from the data on those who have had prior training whether they would be interested in skill enhancement, or learning some new, different skills.

In the design of training programs, this study indicates that public policy would have to differentiate between "beginner" trainees and "advanced" trainees. Furthermore, the success of training programs would be affected by the types of risks a community has experienced in the past or might be exposed to in the future. While the Federal government may apply standardization of relevant training materials, the training of "trainers," or war preparedness programs, it is just as conceivable that local organizations, such as the Red Cross, would be in a position to develop these programs.

In regard to utilizing the large pool of volunteers indicated by this study, there are several factors that should be emphasized. First, the willingness to volunteer is based on direct and personal contact with the public, in this case, telephone calls to each respondent, as opposed to more impersonal recruitment methods, such as newspapers, radio, or television. Second, it should be noted that it may be easier to recruit volunteers than to keep them involved. Success of long term recruitment would depend on the perceived worthwhileness of the activities involving volunteers. An inventory of relevant volunteer activities seems to be called for, which, incidentally, would provide input for the generation of training programs. This inventory would, above all, help to determine the best use of volunteers and, in turn, to define more precisely, and at the appropriate jurisdictional level, the actual pool of volunteers. Third, and finally, a generalized willingness to volunteer does not mean actual volunteering when it comes to specific type of activity. Apart from differentiated interests in specific volunteer activities, the scheduling of these activities may reduce the pool of volunteers to those available on specified times and days.

FINAL REPORT

VOLUNTEERING FOR EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

BY

JIRI NEHNEVAJSA

FEMA COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT NUMBER: EMW-K-1024  
WORK UNIT: 4851B

FOR

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY  
WASHINGTON D.C, 20472

"THIS REPORT HAS BEEN REVIEWED IN THE  
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY  
AND APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION. APPROVAL  
DOES NOT SIGNIFY THAT THE CONTENTS  
NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS AND  
POLICIES OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY  
MANAGEMENT AGENCY."

UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR SOCIAL & URBAN RESEARCH  
1706 CATHEDRAL OF LEARNING  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15260

MAY, 1989

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS None	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY None			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for Public Release: Distribution unlimited	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE				
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION University Center for Social and Urban Research		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable)		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION  FEMA
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 1706 Cathedral of Learning University of Pittsburgh, Pgh., PA 15260			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)  Washington, D.C. 20472	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable)		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER  EMW-K-1024
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.
			TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Volunteering for Emergency Preparedness				
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Jiri Nehnevajsa				
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final		13b. TIME COVERED FROM March 88 TO March 89		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) May 1989
15. PAGE COUNT				
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION				
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Civil Defense, Volunteering, Emergency Preparedness	
			Nuclear War, Emergency Management	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)				
<p>This nation wide quantitative telephone survey predicts levels of voluntary activity for emergency and disaster preparedness. The study involved a random national phone sample of 1,595 respondents in the 48 contiguous states.</p> <p>Actual voluntary activity performed during or immediately following an emergency or disaster is not explicitly considered in the research. Rather, this study attempts to measure willingness to volunteer and willingness to participate in training programs. Training programs are conceptualized to mean both education and practice. The study also includes rating schedules - poor to excellent - for attitudes toward the "self-help" concept and perceived effectiveness of local and Federal government emergency and disaster programs.</p> <p>While the self-help concept rating is considered as a variable in its own right, evaluation consists of its relation to the following variables: prior volunteer experience, the</p>				
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Ralph Swisher			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 646-3561	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL SL-CD-MP



expressed willingness to volunteer, and the perceived effectiveness of each local and Federal government programs. Indices are computed for the perceived effectiveness of government programs, and compared with percentages that reflect respondents ratings of the self-help concept, as well as prior and expressed willingness for volunteering and training activities. Patterns of participation in training and volunteering are also examined.

Overall findings indicate a national consensus toward willingness to participate in both training and volunteering activities. The self-help concept is rated, consistently overall, as a "very good" idea. The perceived effectiveness of local programs rated higher than that of Federal programs, across all comparisons.

Data are also analyzed in terms of geographic areas: counties and administrative regions. Demographics and selected background traits are also compared to responses. No significant relationships are found when claims to voluntary activity are compared to geographic areas and demographics.

It is suggested that public policy in this field be directed toward managing a large pool of volunteers, with the caution that the high rate of claims to volunteering and training is based on direct and personal contact, as opposed to mass appeals for emergency and disaster volunteers, such as newspaper, radio, and television. It is also suggested that public policy on training programs needs to involve local communities, and/or solicit their input.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. A FEW KEY CONCEPTS	2
III. ON SELF-HELP IN COPING WITH EMERGENCIES	5
A. Some Baseline Considerations . . . . .	5
B. Self-help Idea and Government Effectiveness. . . . .	6
C. The Idea of Self-help and Volunteering . . . . .	8
D. Prior Disaster Experience. . . . .	.11
E. Highlights . . . . .	.12
IV. VOLUNTEERING	13
A. Some Baseline Considerations . . . . .	.13
B. Volunteering and Willingness to Volunteer. . . . .	.13
C. Volunteering and Willingness to be Trained . . . . .	.15
D. Willingness to Volunteer and Disaster Experience . . .	.16
E. Time Investment Claims . . . . .	.17
F. Highlights . . . . .	.18
V. EMERGENCY RELATED TRAINING	21
A. Some Baseline Considerations . . . . .	.21
B. Training and Volunteering. . . . .	.23
C. Training and Willingness to Volunteer. . . . .	.25
D. Training and Willingness to be Trained . . . . .	.26
E. Timing of Prior Training and Training Willingness. . .	.28
F. Community Self-help and Household Self-help. . . . .	.31
G. Highlights . . . . .	.34
VI. BACKGROUND FACTORS	37
A. Some Baseline Considerations . . . . .	.37
B. Gender . . . . .	.37
C. Racial Background. . . . .	.38
D. Age. . . . .	.39
E. Marital Status . . . . .	.40
F. Size of Household. . . . .	.41
G. Income . . . . .	.42
H. Number of Wage Earners . . . . .	.43

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
I. Labor Union Membership . . . . .	.44
J. Education. . . . .	.44
K. Religious Preference . . . . .	.45
L. Religiousity . . . . .	.47
M. Highlights . . . . .	.48
VII. SETTINGS	51
A. Some Basic Considerations. . . . .	.51
B. Size of Population . . . . .	.52
C. Regions. . . . .	.54
D. Highlights . . . . .	.60
VIII. SOME POLICY IMPLICATIONS	63

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Effectiveness Indices. . . . .	6
2	Self-help Idea and Government Effectiveness. . . . .	8
3	Volunteering Claims by Self-help Concept Evaluations . .	10
4	The Idea of Self-help and Volunteering Inclinations. . .	11
5	Effectiveness Ratings by Prior Disaster Experience . . .	11
6	Volunteers and EM Volunteering Inclinations. . . . .	15
7	Prior Volunteering and EM Training Willingness . . . .	15
8	Volunteering Willingness and Training Willingness. . .	16
9	Volunteering Intention and Disaster Exposure . . . . .	17
10	Time Investments of Volunteers . . . . .	17
11	Time Possible EM Volunteers are Willing to Spend . . .	18
12	Training Claims. . . . .	22
13	Patterns of Training Claims. . . . .	22
14	Types of Training and Time When Received . . . . .	23
15	Type of Training and Volunteer Work. . . . .	24
16	Training Experiences and Prior Volunteering. . . . .	24
17	Type of Training and Willingness to Volunteer. . . . .	25
18	Training Patterns and Willingness to Volunteer . . . .	26
19	Training Type and Willingness to be Trained. . . . .	27
20	Training Patterns and Willingness to be Retrained. . .	27
21	Health Related Training and Willingness to be Retrained . . . . .	29

# LIST OF TABLES (continued)

<u>Table</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
22	War Related Training and Willingness to be Retrained .	.30
23	Other Disaster Related Training and Retraining Willingness. . . . .	.31
24	Views On Community and Federal Program Effectiveness . . . . .	.53
25	Volunteering Claims and Intentions . . . . .	.54
26	Regional Views on Community and Regional Program Effectiveness . . . . .	.55
27	Perceived Effectiveness of Self-help . . . . .	.56
28	Effectiveness Indices Relative to National Average . .	.56
29	Previous Year's Volunteering Reports . . . . .	.58
30	Training and Volunteering Willingness. . . . .	.59

## I. INTRODUCTION

This brief report focuses on some salient aspects of voluntary participation of our people in activities and programs relevant to emergency management. In an initial overview paper<sup>1</sup> some of the general findings of the study were reported, based on "marginal" or, "aggregate," data of the inquiry as a whole. Here, the report moves to the next (though not by any means final) level of analytic refinement of the general findings.

The study involved a national (phone) sample of 1,595 respondents in the 48 contiguous states of the Union. The sample of phone numbers was provided to the University Center for Social and Urban Research of the University of Pittsburgh by Survey Sampling Inc. of Fairfield, Connecticut. It involves private phone numbers and thus pertains to national households and due to the random process of digit selection, unlisted phone numbers, like the listed ones, have a proportionate probability of also being included in the sample.

In the actual conduct of the field work, the rather long instrument was divided into two parts: all respondents were given the option, at the voluntary completion of responses to the first part of the questionnaire, to express their willingness to pursue the interview, to make arrangements with the interviewers to be called at some other time to answer questions of the second part of the instrument, or, of course, to state their unwillingness to respond to any further probes either at the time of the initial interview or later on.

Of the 1,595 respondents in the sample who completed the initial (and longer) first part of the inquiry, 1,398 (87.6 percent) were willing to respond to the second part as well and did so, and by far most of them right away. Thus for some questions the sample base of 1,595 is appropriate, while for some other items, the base is 1,398. As necessary, the difference will be indicated throughout.

Three types of variables are involved in this exploration: for one, an item which concerned the respondent rating of the idea, or concept, of "self-help" at the local level when it comes to emergency management issues; second, items which have to do with willingness to volunteer for emergency management activities and programs; third, items which refer to the respondent's willingness to update or upgrade or, for that matter, receive training that would develop, sustain or enhance the skills and knowledge relevant to emergency preparedness and coping. Some key interactions among these types and clusters of variables are also considered in this report though, at this second level of analysis, not all questions which the data permit us to answer are covered.

---

<sup>1</sup> Some Issues in Emergency Management: Public Views 1987,  
September 1987.

## II. A FEW KEY CONCEPTS

At the community level, any voluntary involvements in efforts to increase disaster and emergency preparedness may, of course, take several forms: for the purposes of this inquiry, voluntary activities during an emergency or (as is quite common) in its immediate aftermath to help in rescue, cleanup, relief and reconstruction efforts are not explicitly considered.

Now the simplest form of involvement has to do with the acquisition and maintenance of knowledge and skills to deal with an emergency at the household level. That is, the ability on the part of at least one member of the household to facilitate coping with an impending disaster (and, indeed, upon its occurrence and thereafter). This is, of course, "self-help" in the narrowest sense of the term.

Another central pattern of self-help concerns the possibility of being involved in a community group or organization which seeks to enhance community and not solely individual household competence to deal with disasters and emergencies.

The capacity to respond with some degree of effectiveness, then; involves knowing what to do and knowing how to do it when such knowledge and such skills are needed to be "put to use." While knowledge as such might well be acquirable by perusal of various printed instructional manuals, or by listening or, indeed, by watching films or videocassettes, skills needed to put such know-how to use are generally not easy to come by without practice. And if knowledge dissemination may be referred to as education, the development of corresponding skills merits to be viewed as training. This amounts to saying that many disaster and emergency relevant capabilities require both education and training, and training, in good measure a consequence of practice, cannot be accomplished simply by reading manuals or viewing whatever audio-visual materials per se.

It is this kind of a conceptualization that dictated a probe into the willingness of the respondents to undergo emergency and disaster related training. And since many respondents may have had some such training somewhere along the line, it becomes similarly crucial to establish whether the subjects of the study (and possibly some other member of their household) did, in fact, have such prior training.

The willingness to undergo training then can be looked at both in terms of retraining intentions (those with some previous relevant training who are willing to update or upgrade their training) and new training intentions (willingness to be trained on the part of those who make no claims to previous relevant training experiences). In turn, however, a response that one would not be willing to undergo emergency and disaster related training should not be construed strictly as "unwillingness" without understanding some likely reasons. Among such key reasons, inability to participate in this or that training program, due to such factors as health or age (or both), the need to take care of small children in the household would "show up" as statements of "unwillingness" to become involved in training programs. For those with prior training, a sense that one does not "need" to be retrained would serve yet as another factor in explaining a negative answer to the "willingness to be retrained to trained" probe.

This conceptualization, however, does not differentiate between those who might seek retraining or training in order to be better able to deal with emergencies at the household level (or, perhaps, for the benefit of relatives, friends and more immediate neighbors) and those whose intentions reflect a broader community self-help notion. The probe on "willingness to volunteer for disaster and emergency preparedness programs" comes, as it were, to the rescue. It is reasonable to argue that people who are (a) willing to acquire disaster related training but are (b) unwilling to volunteer in a more general sense for emergency and disaster programs are likely to be oriented to the household level self-help, while those willing both (a) to be trained and (b) volunteer for EM related programs are, in turn, more oriented to the community level effort in a more organized manner.

Furthermore, it follows that the pattern may be quite different for those with some prior training for whom participation in subsequent training programs amounts mainly to upgrading (or possibly expanding) their training and those not previously trained. Thus the study instrument reflects the data requirements: a question regarding claims of prior training, a question concerning willingness to be trained or retrained, and a probe regarding willingness to volunteer for disaster and emergency management programs.

But the evaluation of the very idea of "self-help" provides yet another interpretive axis: is "self-help" specifically referring to activities not involving Government funds an appealing concept, and to what extent, and how does it relate to willingness to be trained or, indeed, to volunteer in the more general sense? Thus the instrument also included a rating probe of the idea of "self-help."

In some communities such self-help groups and activities have been in existence: why, then, not ask about the respondent's knowledge of such groups, and of their possible involvement in such groups, rather than to seek data on the assessment of the "idea" of self-help at the community level? Since such actual programs are relatively quite rare, a national sample of some 1,600 does not stand much of a chance to uncover any number of instances that would be analytically interesting. The study included many other questions, all considered by the researchers as being of higher priority. The search for such "rare events" was not undertaken because it would have to have occurred at the cost of not asking other questions which were deemed more important. The rating of the "concept" of community self-help thus served as a proxy as well as a variable of worth in its own right, given the possibility that the emergency management programs might well entertain the notion of encouraging the formation of such groupings across the nation.

The "rating" of self-help, furthermore, concerns the perceived effectiveness to "cope with emergencies", were such groups and activities in place. It is, then, prudent to contextualize the responses by probing how effective or ineffective Government programs to deal with emergencies appear. For this reason, questions were asked about the evaluated effectiveness of (a) local and (b) Federal programs to deal with disasters and emergencies. This, of course, makes it possible to determine whether there is more or less of an inclination to favor the idea of self-help dependent on the perceived "quality" and "ability" of (local and Federal) Government financed programs.



When it comes to the probe regarding willingness to volunteer for disaster and emergency preparedness programs (apart from the saliency of the item along the lines indicated previously), yet another central concern results: Americans undertake a great deal of voluntary activity and spend a great deal of time in so doing. To what extent is the orientation to "volunteering for disaster and emergency preparedness programs" different or similar for those who have been involved in voluntary work and those who have not? In fact, does the potential "pool" of EM-type volunteers consist mainly of individuals already engaged in volunteering or mainly of those not quite so active?

Clearly, this line of thinking dictated the inclusion of simple questions about "past year's" volunteering experiences, and an effort to seek an approximate estimate of time spent in such activities in the course of the prior 12 months. And this, again, drove the decision to also seek to determine, by respondent self-assessments, how much time they would be willing, or prepared, to spend in volunteering for disaster and emergency preparedness programs if they were willing to volunteer in the first place. It is then conceptualization of this kind that served as determinants of the central questions or probes which needed to be included in the instrument.

It may well not be out of place to mention the central result even in these introductory remarks: there exists wide and robust consensus in the nation's public on the worthwhileness of self-help approaches in the community, on the willingness to avail oneself of training or retraining opportunities, and on inclinations to do voluntary work for, and in connection with, local emergency management programs.

### III. ON SELF-HELP IN COPING WITH EMERGENCIES

#### A. Some Baseline Considerations

Asked to rate, in terms of importance, several specified but altogether realistic goals of emergency management programs, the respondents (having generally given high importance ratings to all the objectives that were postulated) gave an extremely high importance rating to the need for civil defense programs "to provide information so people can help themselves respond to emergencies."<sup>1</sup> Given the maximum value of the importance index of 100, this objective had an index value of 93.0, second only to the need to "warn the public of impending danger" (with an index value of 93.9).

The central notion of "people helping themselves" provided that they get usable information, and provided that the emergency management system enables them to be warned of danger, of an impending emergency, amounts to a crucial form of self-help, or better yet, the desirability of self-help. It says, in effect, that people can, and would, respond prudently when faced with an emergency as long as they are somehow informed that it might occur (the warning function) and what would prove to be reasonable actions to take.

Elsewhere in the study instrument, the respondents were also asked to rate, on a scale running from "excellent" to "poor" the effectiveness of both the local and the Federal Governments to deal with, or manage, emergencies and disasters, and they were also asked to provide a similar rating to the very idea of community self-help programs. In fact, the questions were as follows:

"How well does your community deal with disasters and emergencies?"

"How well does the Federal Government deal with disasters and emergencies?"

Each of these items was followed up by:

"Would you rate their effectiveness as excellent, very good, good, fair or poor?"

In turn, the question requesting a rating of the concept of self-help activities was stated in the following manner:

"A lot of communities have self-help groups that develop and carry out programs mostly on their own, without involvement or funding by the Government. When it comes to emergency preparedness, would you rate the idea of such self-help groups as excellent, very good, good, fair or poor?"

For the sake of parsimony, a simple index was generated with a range from 0 to 100: it would have a value of 100 had all respondents responded with a rating of "excellent," and it would, on

---

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., p. 5, Table 1

the other hand, yield a value of 0 (zero) if all had used the "poor" answer on the verbal rating scale. Table 1 replicates a summary contained in the overall report:<sup>2</sup>

Table 1

EFFECTIVENESS INDICES

<u>Item</u>	<u>Effectiveness Index</u>
Local Government	54.4
Federal Government	49.4
<hr/>	
Idea of local self-help	61.6
<hr/>	

The idea of self-help activities at the local level is, thus, quite appealing, the index "sitting" between the "good" and "very good" rating when viewed in terms of the verbal responses which were used to generate the index. The effectiveness of local Government to deal with emergencies has a (somewhat) lower rating, and the effectiveness of Federal efforts falls slightly below the "good" rating.<sup>3</sup>

B. Self-help Idea and Government Effectiveness

Consider now the relationship between perceptions of Government effectiveness in coping with emergencies and the evaluation of the community self-help concept. From one perspective, five major results seem possible - and, of course, the results could be different for the relation between local Government effectiveness and the self-help notion and Federal Government effectiveness and self-help.

1. The higher the Government effectiveness perception, the more appealing the idea of self-help. In an important sense, such a finding would suggest that self-help activities at the

---

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. p.74, Table 34 for the local and Federal Government rating, and p.75, Table 35 for the rating of the self-help concept. Here, the percentage distributions are provided as well which are not included in this report for which the general data form but a baseline.

<sup>3</sup> This is not an unusual finding: by generally rating Federal programs of just about any kind less favorable than either local or state activities, Americans are, sort of, "telling Washington off" and "making a statement about the "distant" Federal "bureaucracy" that "does not understand" local problems and needs.

community level would tend to complement, and thus further strengthen, already effective Government programs.

2. The higher the Government effectiveness, the less appealing the self-help concept. Such a result, in turn, might indicate that the respondents think that self-help might supplement emergency management capabilities of the Government, whether local or Federal or both, and thus help overcome what are seen as deficiencies in existing emergency management systems.
3. The relation, too, could be of a U-shaped variety: thus people who give favorable ratings to Government as well as those who think that the Government capabilities are rather poor would tend to endorse self-help more than others. In this pattern, the "complementing" and "supplementing" "functions" of self-help efforts would appear with the consequence that self-help would be most appealing in municipalities with either already rather "excellent" emergency management capabilities or those where such capabilities are considered to be rather inadequate.
4. An inverted U-shaped outcome is also a possibility. It would indicate that in communities where EM programs are judged as rather very good already, there seems little need to enhance their performance by self-help measures. And it would mean that in communities with rather poor capabilities, as estimated by the respondents, self-help would not, perhaps, work either. In this pattern, the most favorable evaluations of the self-help concept would then occur where the Government effectiveness is judged as "good" (or thereabouts) but neither as "excellent" or "poor."
5. The specification of the fifth, final, pattern is then rather obvious: the appeal of the idea of self-help efforts might be simply insensitive to variability in perceptions of Government effectiveness. Thus regardless of how people assess the effectiveness of Government, whether local, Federal or both, they find the concept of self-help about equally worthwhile. In other words, the indices would hover around the sample-wide value of 61.6 (and in the strictest sense, they would all turn out to be 61.6 irrespective of Government effectiveness assessments.)

The findings are presented in Table 2.

The evidence is quite strong. It supports the "complementarity" hypothesis. And it holds basically both with respect to evaluations of local and Federal Government capabilities. The self-help concept is the more appealing the more favorable is the view of existing Governmental capabilities, both local and Federal.

Thus self-help finds the most fertile soil in communities in which emergency management efforts are already seen as very good or even excellent, while it has less, although still quite a lot, support in communities in which local Governmental efforts do not seem to fare too well in the eyes of the respondents. Of course, this interpretation is somewhat vulnerable in that it is phrased in terms of "communities" while the data as such have to do with individual respondent ratings and are not, in this aggregate form, "anchored" in similarities or variabilities of the communities themselves. It is, indeed, individual respondents who rate Government efforts variably, who

express themselves, with the variability indicated, about the worthwhileness of self-help activities.<sup>4</sup>

Table 2

Self-Help Idea and Government Effectiveness

Government Rating	Self-Help Concept Evaluations given effectiveness of	
	Local Government	Federal programs
Excellent	77.5	77.3
Very good	67.1	69.1
Good	58.7	62.8
Fair	53.4	53.3
Poor	47.1	55.8
<hr/>		
Don't Know	62.9	54.7
<hr/>		

The findings also suggest the following: when (and where) local emergency management efforts are seen as not particularly adequate, self-help is also least likely to flourish to help augment, or supplement, such deficiencies as may be seen by the public. And yet, in a manner of speaking, these would be precisely the kinds of circumstances under which self-help efforts could (or even would) have the most benign consequences.

C. The Idea of Self-Help and Volunteering

Any self-help activities are, by definition, of a voluntary nature. In this study, of course, there are no direct measures of such self-help effort as might already be "in place" (an unfortunate omission, perhaps): there are but data on rating of the concept of local self-help.

Two questions on volunteering are particularly salient. One solicits a claim regarding a fact of voluntary involvement in the prior 12 month period. The second question concerns the intention, or willingness, to volunteer for activities related to emergencies and disasters.

---

<sup>4</sup> A "community-level" analysis as such is not possible since there are relatively few respondents from each of the cities, towns or other municipalities in the sample.

The volunteering questions were included in the second part of the instrument. The base for this analysis then consists only of the respondents who answered both parts of the questionnaire. But since the self-help question was included in the first part of the instrument, it is clearly possible to see how these respondents, who could not or did not choose to, continue the interview (or make arrangements for a later interview continuation) evaluated the self-help concept.

- Among respondents, 34.7 percent of the sample, who claimed to have done voluntary work in the course of the 12 months preceding the study, the self-help concept yielded a rating of 65.1, somewhat higher than the national average.
- Among those who did not report volunteering in the prior 12 months, the self-help idea index is 60.0.
- Among respondents who did not complete the second part of the interview - and whose prior volunteering experiences therefore could not be ascertained, the self-help index is 59.7.

The results indicate that the evaluations of possible self-help programs are not dramatically different for those engaged in voluntary activities and others, although there is a modest tendency for the "volunteers" to find the self-help concept somewhat more appealing.

Completing the second part of the survey was, in itself, a kind of volunteering activity: the self-help rating index for those who did not offer to continue being questioned yields a value which is nearly exactly that of those who said that they did not do any voluntary work in the preceding 12 months. It suggests then that these respondents were themselves predominantly non-volunteers and would have so responded had they had an opportunity to answer the second segment of the interview.

Now a different, and complementary question, can be raised: how many respondents claimed to have been involved in volunteering in each of the self-help assessment categories? Table 3 presents the finding.

Here, a weak U-shaped pattern emerges. Those who thought quite highly of the (volunteering) notion of self-help and those who did not find the prospect attractive (having given it a "poor" rating) were more likely to report previous year's volunteering than did other respondents. And those assigning the self-help concept an "excellent" rating include significantly more volunteers than does any other one of the rating groups, including those who used the "poor" term to describe their idea about self-help.

Table 3

## Volunteering Claims by Self-Help Concept Evaluations

<u>Self-Help Rating</u>	<u>Percent Volunteers</u>
Excellent	47.1
Very good	34.3
Good	30.2
Fair	31.9
Poor	37.0
<hr/>	
Don't Know	29.5
<hr/>	

How then is the self-help idea seen by respondents who expressed themselves differently about their willingness to volunteer for emergency and disaster related activities and programs?

- Respondents who said that they would be inclined to volunteer for EM programs (75.7 percent of the relevant sample in all!<sup>5</sup>) yielded a self-help worth index of 62.9.
- Those who were unsure about their willingness and gave the "depends" response (8.7 percent of the sample) rated self-help with a value of 59.0.
- Respondents unwilling, or unlikely, to volunteer for emergency and disaster types of programs (13.7 percent of the sample) yielded a self-help value index of 58.3.

The differences then are quite small, though there is, indeed, a very slight tendency to give higher marks to self-help activities by those likely, or inclined, to volunteer for emergency management types of programs. This suggests, of course, that "self-help" is seen as a rather important voluntary activity even among those who might not be prone to volunteer for emergency management types of programs in a more general sense.

Now, of course, one would expect that the inclination to volunteer should be the higher the more favorable views the respondents hold about self-help. After all, self-help efforts are, in fact, one such crucial cluster of possible voluntary involvements in emergency management. The findings, presented in Table 4, support this expectation.

---

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit., p.47, Table 23.

Yet, of course, the willingness to volunteer is very high regardless of the perspective on self-help; in other words, even those who do not think very much of the self-help concept are very willing, over 70 percent of them, to engage in voluntary activities that would enhance the community's capabilities to deal with emergencies and disasters of all kinds.

Table 4

The Idea of Self-Help and Volunteering Inclinations

<u>Self-Help Rating</u>	<u>Percent Willing To Volunteer</u>
Excellent	79.9
Very good	78.4
Good	74.9
Fair	70.2
Poor	70.4
<hr/>	
Don't Know	67.4
<hr/>	

D. Prior Disaster Experience

Some 26.6 percent of the respondents reported having had at least one prior experience with a disaster or emergency of a major kind. Table 5 shows how the idea of self-help fared among those with prior disaster exposure(s) and those without such an experience; and it also shows the effectiveness ratings of both local and Federal Governmental capabilities to cope with disasters.

Table 5

Effectiveness Ratings by Prior Disaster Experience

<u>Disaster Experience</u>	<u>Self-help Programs</u>	<u>Local Government</u>	<u>Federal</u>
Yes	63.4	56.6	46.6
No	61.0	53.9	48.0



Throughout, the differences are quite negligible. Thus, essentially the effectiveness of Government and the possible effectiveness of the self-help activities is seen alike, regardless of prior exposure to a major disaster; but it is not without interest to note that local Government's effectiveness is seen slightly higher by those with prior disaster exposure than by others; while the effectiveness of the Federal effort is viewed as somewhat better by those with no previous disaster experience. Once again: people who have lived through some prior catastrophe seem to be, if very slightly only, expressing some dissatisfaction with what they see as Federal programs. Nonetheless, it is important to repeat that the differences are very small indeed.

#### E. Highlights

The main findings, as they bear on the self-help concept, can be summarized as follows:

1. Self-help activities are considered the more favorably the more positive is the evaluation of both local and Federal Government's emergency and disaster management efforts. *The idea of self-help, thus, complements more already very good Governmental efforts rather than supplementing programs seen as less adequate.*
2. Somewhat more than non-volunteers, people with prior volunteering experience find the self-help concept appealing.
3. More "past year's" volunteers are among those who rated the idea of self-help at the extremes: as either "excellent" or "poor."
4. There are essentially no differences in evaluating the idea of self-help among people who expressed variable willingness to volunteer their time and effort for emergency and disaster related activities and programs.
5. Yet, the higher the support for the idea of self-help, the greater the willingness to volunteer for EM types of efforts.
6. But willingness to serve as a volunteer for disaster related programs is very high in all groups despite this pattern.
7. Experiences with prior disasters do not have any effect on the appeal of the self-help idea. The ratings of self-help are thus the same for those with previous disaster exposure(s) and for those without such prior experience.

## IV. VOLUNTEERING

### A. Some Baseline Considerations

The research revealed, not unexpectedly, high levels of voluntary involvements on the part of the respondents in the relevant sample (N=1398). Even more, it showed intentions to do voluntary work in "emergency and disaster preparedness programs" to characterize some 3 out of 4 Americans.<sup>1</sup>

- In fact, 34.7 percent of the respondents reported some voluntary activity in the 12 months preceding the inquiry.
- They spent, in median terms, just about 2 hours per week on such effort.
- Furthermore, 75.7 percent claimed their willingness to offer their voluntary services for programs of emergency and disaster preparedness,
- and, on balance, would be prepared to invest also about 2 hours per week toward these ends.

Among respondents inclined to volunteer for disaster related programs, 27.4 percent have some special skills to offer: being able to provide medical help or first aid, able and willing to cook and feed, teach, manage, help with communications or apply their clerical skills.<sup>2</sup> In this context, the respondents clearly did not think of their ability to "drive" as a potentially relevant skill: undoubtedly, this is so simply because just about everyone can drive.

### B. Volunteering and Willingness to Volunteer

The question, of course, arises whether voluntary work for emergency and disaster preparedness programs would tend to "tap" the existing pool of volunteers or those without prior volunteering involvements. Thus there are three main outcomes to consider:

1. There could be significantly more people willing to invest their time in EM type of volunteering among those who have been already involved as volunteers otherwise than among those who did not volunteer in the recent past.

---

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. especially pp. 47-49.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. p. 48 for more detail along these lines.

2. There could be significantly more potential EM volunteers among those without previous volunteering claims than among those who have already been engaged in voluntary activities.
3. In both groups, that of volunteers as well as non-volunteers, the willingness to engage in voluntary activity for emergency and disaster preparedness programs could be (essentially) the same.

The first outcome entails some hidden costs to the community: it has the potential implication that those among current volunteers who would invest their time in EM volunteering would do so, or have to do so, at the expense of some of their other volunteering activities. In that sense then, EM related volunteering would tend to compete with other programs that utilize voluntary workers for a large, though limited, manpower pool.

The second outcome amounts mainly to augmenting the existing pool of volunteers in that the EM volunteering would attract people who have not otherwise offered their time and effort for other programs (at least not in the most recent period).

Of course, the general result constrains the possibilities. The finding, after all, was that 34.7 percent of the respondents did some prior volunteering, but 75.7 percent would be prepared, by their assertion, to do voluntary work for disaster preparedness programs.

Thus if all volunteers of the previous year were to volunteer for EM activities, the volunteering willingness among prior non-volunteers would have to be some 62.5 percent for the basic (marginal or aggregate) result to hold.

If, in turn, all non-volunteers were to convert to EM volunteering, there would still have to be some 29.6 percent drawn from among the volunteers.

The third outcome is, of course, obvious: EM volunteering can be equally attractive to people regardless of their prior voluntary involvements. But since there are about two non-volunteers per volunteer, the outcome also implies that the volunteers for EM programs would consist of about one third of prior volunteers and two-thirds of new volunteers.

Table 6 provides the pertinent data on the basis of which it is possible to decide which of the three key outcomes the results map onto.

The finding supports the third outcome: volunteers for emergency and disaster preparedness programs are just about equally likely to be drawn from the ranks of volunteers as from the pool of non-volunteers. It then, also of necessity, implies that among the possible EM volunteers, about one third would tend to be drawn from those who have already been engaged in voluntary work (actually, it amounts to 36.1 percent in this instance) and the remaining ones from among previous non-volunteers.

Table 6

## Volunteers and EM Volunteering Inclinations

<u>Willingness To Volunteer</u>	<u>Previous Year's Volunteering</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Yes	78.6	73.9
Depends	10.7	8.0
No	9.5	15.9
<hr/>		
Don't Know	1.2	2.2
<hr/>		

C. Volunteering and Willingness to be Trained

Intentions or expressions of willingness to update such emergency and disaster related training as the respondents may have had, or to acquire relevant skills and knowledge among those without any such prior training, amount to another form of voluntary activity.<sup>3</sup>

Table 7 shows that "past year's" volunteers were somewhat more likely to say that they would be willing to update training or receive training. But the difference is relatively small, so that it is appropriate to conclude that prior volunteering experience is not, in itself, a factor in a possible decision to acquire disaster related knowledge and skills through training.

Table 7

## Prior Volunteering and EM Training Willingness

<u>Prior Volunteering</u>	<u>Willingness to be Trained</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Depends</u>	<u>No</u>
Yes	81.3	6.0	10.7
No	76.1	4.5	15.9

Note: Row percentages do not add up to 100. The few don't knows are not tabulated.

---

<sup>3</sup> The next section of the paper deals with training background and willingness to be trained in further detail.

Some 75.7 percent of the respondents expressed their willingness to become volunteers in emergency and disaster preparedness programs. What, in turn, are their willingness expressions when it come to updating their training or being trained? Table 8 provides the basic information.

Table 8

Volunteering Willingness and Training Willingness

Willingness to <u>Volunteer</u>	Willingness to be Trained		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Depends</u>	<u>No</u>
Yes	85.8	3.3	5.7
Depends	63.2	19.2	12.8
No	46.6	5.2	44.0
<hr/>			
Don't Know	53.8	3.8	23.1
<hr/>			

Note: Row percentages do not add up to 100. The few who "didn't know" about their intentions to be retrained or trained are not tabulated.

Here, the data indicate a robust relationship: the more inclined the respondents are to volunteer for EM preparedness programs, the more they are also willing to be retrained or trained. That about 20 percent of those who gave the "depends" answer to the volunteering question made the same response with regard to the training item is not surprising. What is important, however, is the observation that 63.2 percent of these respondents (in all, some 8.9 percent of the relevant sample of 1,398) did indicate their willingness to undergo retraining or training even though they were undecided about their more general willingness to engage in volunteering for emergency preparedness programs. For these respondents then, training and education in emergency and disaster related skills represents a kind of voluntary activity which they do support, though they are unsure about other forms of possible voluntary participation.

D. Willingness to Volunteer and Disaster Experience

The findings displayed in Table 9 indicate that there is rather little in the way of a difference in volunteering intentions of those who reported prior experience(s) with a major disaster and those who have not been victimized yet at all.

Table 9

## Volunteering Intentions and Disaster Exposure

Experience with <u>Disaster</u>	Willingness to Volunteer		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Depends</u>	<u>No</u>
Yes	79.5	6.9	12.5
No	74.2	9.7	14.0

Note: 1.1 percent of those with prior disaster experience and 2.1 percent of those without such an exposure "didn't know" whether or not they might volunteer.

This means, of course, that the basic claims regarding willingness to volunteer for emergency and disaster preparedness programs is rather insensitive to prior disaster experiences even though the finding shows a small tendency for those with prior exposure(s) to be more inclined to volunteer.

E. Time Investment Claims

The data of Table 10 show the percentages of respondents who reported to have invested given amounts of time to their "last year's" voluntary efforts and those who offered an estimate of the time they would be willing to spend in volunteering for programs of disaster and emergency preparedness.

Table 10

## Time Investments of Volunteers

<u>Hours per Month</u>	<u>Volunteers</u>	<u>EM Intentions+</u>
1 - 10	59.3	46.8
11 - 20	20.8	23.6
21 - 40	10.8	10.6
41 or more	9.1	19.0

+Prior year's volunteers who expressed willingness to volunteer for disaster and emergency preparedness programs and provided information about hours per month they might be prepared to spend in so doing.

The evidence indicates, in aggregate terms, that there are substantially more respondents who would be prepared to spend a great deal of time (41 hours or even more) per month in their disaster and emergency preparedness program volunteering than reported such time investments in their "past year's" actual voluntary work. And there were, of course, almost twice as many respondents who stated their intentions to volunteer for EM types of programs than there were of those who reported prior year's voluntary efforts.

The data of Table 6 showed that by far most of those who did some voluntary work in the previous year would also be prepared to volunteer for disaster and emergency preparedness programs (in fact, 78.6 percent of them). Further insight, in terms of time investments, can thus be gained by considering the amount of time (in hours per month) these previous year's volunteers said they would invest in EM related volunteering. Table 11 contains the basic finding.

Table 11

Time Possible EM Volunteers Are Willing to Spend

Hours Spent Last Year <u>Volunteering</u>	Average Hours Willing to Spend <u>for EM Volunteering</u>
1 - 10	16.4
11 - 20	19.9
21 - 40	26.5
41 or more	35.6

Thus, indeed, the more time "last year's" volunteers spent in their activities, the more time they would be prepared, on balance, to spend in volunteering for disaster and emergency preparedness efforts.

#### F. Highlights

The major results, as they pertain to volunteering for disaster preparedness programs may be summarized as follows:

1. Some 75.7 percent of the respondents in the sample as a whole express their willingness to engage in voluntary activities related to emergencies and disasters and another 8.7 percent potentially so.
2. The chances are about equal that EM related volunteering would attract people with and without prior volunteering record.
3. The resulting pool of possible EM volunteers would thus include about one third of people who have invested time and effort in other voluntary activities (and thus, to an extent,

perhaps compete with such other activities) and two thirds of "new" volunteers, those who have not been involved in voluntary work - or at least not in the course of the preceding 12 months.

4. Both prior volunteers and non-volunteers express very similar willingness to be retrained or trained in EM related skills and knowledge.
5. The more likely people are to volunteer for programs of emergency and disaster preparedness, the more likely they express their intention to participate in retraining or training were it offered.
6. Willingness to volunteer for disaster and emergency preparedness programs is essentially not different for those who have had some prior major disaster experience and those who have not.
7. Among previous year's volunteers, the more time per month they reported to have spent in voluntary work, the more time they also claim to be prepared to invest in volunteering for programs of disaster and emergency preparedness.

Clearly, there are significant constraints connected with any actual implementation of even seriously meant intentions to volunteer, or for that matter, to do this or that. On any given day, only some (unknown) portion of those really willing to devote their time to voluntary work would be able to do so and others would, on that particular day, be unwilling (while remaining basically altogether willing) because of other commitments.

Similarly, during any given time period (of any given day) some may be unable or unwilling to carry out their intentions.

And, of course, the way in which people might be solicited for voluntary involvements may significantly affect the actualizations of the intentions: in this inquiry, questions were asked (a) of individuals and (b) quite directly: in other words, any or all "mass approaches" (radio or TV or newspaper messages) create an altogether different situation and the prospects for volunteering cannot be estimated from these data for appeals other than direct and personal ones.

Yet, consider 100,000 adults (people 18 years of age and older, a plural that maps onto the limitations of the study: younger people were not included in the sample at all). If 75.7 percent of them were actually to implement their willingness to volunteer, this would amount to 75,700 people and even the best emergency management system would probably be unable to put their time and effort to some productive use.

But suppose only 10 percent were actually to carry out their intentions: this still amounts to 7,570 volunteers in a "prototype" of 100,000 adult residents! And if, in fact, on any given day or at any given time the actual volunteering would be but 5 percent of these 10 percent, it still comes out as 378 volunteers!



Thus even if only one twentieth of those inclined to volunteer were to carry out their intentions, some 3.8 percent of adults, 18 years of age and older, could be mobilized. And this, indeed, is an exceptionally conservative estimate: people actually carry out their intentions with much higher frequency than 1 in 20.

There are, additionally, quite a few willing volunteers in the 16 to 18 year age bracket, a category not considered in the study at all.

Finally, the study in no way estimates the typical surplus of volunteers during an actual emergency and in its immediate aftermath. The item regarding volunteering propensity was specifically phrased in terms of "disaster and emergency preparedness programs."

## V. EMERGENCY RELATED TRAINING

### A. Some Baseline Considerations

Many respondents asserted that they were trained or educated in some aspect of disaster related work:<sup>1</sup>

- 59.4 percent said they had some first aid know-how.
- 45.8 percent claimed to have been trained in the use of CPR.
- 10.7 percent stated that they had some exposure to knowledge and training bearing on coping with a nuclear war.
- 6.6 percent received some paramedic training.
- 5.7 percent responded that they were trained to do radiological monitoring.
- 4.3 percent reported to have been trained to manage shelters.
- 17.8 percent referred to "other" (than the above) emergency or disaster related training or knowledge.

It is not clear what such "other" training, as was claimed by the respondents, may have consisted of. Unfortunately, a probe was not included in the inquiry: but it may well involve health services (physicians, nurses, technicians), fire fighting, policing, communications and such. In terms of occupational background of these respondents, it should be possible to determine whether these are the likely patterns of such "other" emergency related training. The issue, however, is not taken up at the moment.

Now, apart from this group of "others" (those with training claims in that response category), it seems plausible to divide the respondents into two groupings: those with "health"-related training (first aid, CPR and paramedic) and those with "war"-related training (nuclear war coping, radiological monitoring, shelter management). It is, of course, not an altogether "clean" differentiation: the health-relevant skills are certainly applicable in all situations, including the possible nuclear holocaust; the war-related skills, if such they are, have applicability in peacetime nuclear environments or, as concerns "shelter management," also with respect to peacetime disasters which require, or result in, "sheltering."

Be that as it may, Table 12 shows the distribution of these claims for the "health-related," and "war-related" hazards and for those whose response indicated "other training" than that which was explicitly asked for in the six study items.

---

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 44, especially Table 22.

Table 12  
Training Claims

<u>Type of Training</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Health-related	64.2
War-related	14.5
"Other" training*	17.8
None	33.0

\*Note: "Other" such training could be anything except for the specific training about which the respondents were asked: first aid, CPR, paramedic, nuclear war coping, shelter management, radiological monitoring: thus applicable potentially in any emergency circumstance.

Thus in the "health-related" respondent segment are people who claimed to have had training in first aid or in CPR or as paramedics. In the "war-related" grouping are those who said that they had received training in ways to cope with a nuclear war or in radiological monitoring or in shelter management.

But, of course, some people may have acquired skills and know-how that "fit" into these different groupings: both health and war-related, or both war-related and "other" (which, it needs to be repeated, could have also been "war-related" though not explicitly involving the items the respondents were asked about). Table 13 shows the distribution of the resulting patterns.

Table 13  
Patterns of Training Claims

<u>Health--War--Other</u>			<u>Percent</u>
Yes	Yes	Yes	6.9
Yes	Yes	No	6.5
Yes	No	Yes	9.1
Yes	No	No	41.6
No	Yes	Yes	0.2
No	Yes	No	0.9
No	No	Yes	1.6
No	No	No	32.9

Note: The questions were asked in the second part of the interview. The relevant sample therefore includes 1,398 respondents.

In other words, health-related training and no other training dominates - not an unexpected finding in view of the fact that so many respondents claimed to have had "first aid" training. And those who received no emergency related training of any kind, by their own reports, amount to one third of the sample.

Looking only at the basic types (health, war and other types of training relevant to emergencies and disasters), it is certainly of interest to determine when, on balance, such training might have taken place. Indeed, an effort to understand the willingness of people to be retrained needs to be anchored also in information about the time that has lapsed since the respondents undertook some previous training.

Table 14

Types of Training and Time When Received

<u>Time of Training</u>	<u>Type of Training</u>		
	<u>Health</u>	<u>War</u>	<u>Other</u>
1 year or less ago	29.2	30.8	43.9
2 to 5 years ago	37.9	20.2	26.8
6 to 10 years ago	16.3	17.7	16.7
11 or more years ago	16.6	31.3	12.6

Thus, respondents who claimed training "other" than that about which they were explicitly asked (health: first aid, CPR, and paramedic; war: dealing with nuclear war, management of shelters, and radiological monitoring) have acquired their knowledge and skills most recently. In turn, those with war-related training tend to date it back beyond a 10 year span most often - and about as many also refer to their training exposure in the course of the previous year.

B. Training and Volunteering

What might be said about the relationship between some prior exposure to training and the pattern of "last year's" voluntary involvements of the respondents? Table 15 contains the basic result for respondents who received some health-related training (specifically, either first aid, CPR or paramedic training, or any combinations), war-related training (specifically, radiological monitoring, training in coping with a nuclear conflict, shelter management) or "other" disaster related training and those with no such previous training.

Table 15

## Type of Training and Volunteer Work

<u>Training Type</u>	<u>Percent Volunteers</u>
Health-related	42.2
War-related	46.8
Other training*	46.6
No training	21.1

\*Note: Training claims related to disasters and emergencies but involving training other than types explicitly included in the health- and war-related categories.

Thus people with some prior training have been more than twice as likely to report some "last year's" voluntary work than were respondents with no training. In turn, those who did receive some prior training were just about as likely to volunteer whether such training involved some health-related, war-related or other disaster-related skills and knowledge.

But, of course, as is clear from the data in Table 13, many respondents received training that would cut across two or more of the categories of the above Table 15. Only four of the eight possible patterns (of Table 13) include sufficient numbers of respondents to be of further interest. Table 16 provides the information.

Table 16

## Training Experiences and Prior Volunteering

<u>Training Pattern</u>	<u>Percent Volunteers</u>
Health/"Other"	49.6
Health/War/"Other"	47.9
Health/War	47.3
Health*	38.8

\*Note: "Health" here is not the exact same group of respondents as in Table 15. Here, the category includes only those who reported some health related training but no other training.

Those with previous training only in the specific health-related skills about which the respondents were asked were less likely to have been involved in voluntary work than were

others, but, of course, significantly more so that people who levied no prior training claims (as seen from Table 15).

In all then, and not unexpectedly, volunteering flourishes more among people with some prior training that can be possibly used in their voluntary activities than among people without any prior training; but a caution needs to be exercised even in this respect. Although it is doubtful that the results would turn out to be significantly different anyway: the questions about training experiences all referred to some of the training types that have to do with their plausible applicability in disasters and emergencies. Thus there well may be others in the study who would have reported "other" training experiences which, however, did not fit any of the specific questions raised nor did they, in their own estimation, fit the category of "other" training since that question as well posited training relevant to disasters and emergencies only.

### C. Training and Willingness to Volunteer

In a form parallel to the issues raised in the previous section of the report, the question now may be raised regarding the relationship between prior training experiences and the expressed willingness to volunteer for disaster and emergency preparedness programs.

Table 17

#### Type of Training and Willingness to Volunteer

<u>Training Type</u>	<u>Willingness to Volunteer</u>
Health-related	79.4
War-related	81.3
Other	79.1
None	69.3

The finding replicates the results of Table 15 in its basic pattern: people with some prior training were much more likely to say that they would be willing to become involved, as volunteers, also in disaster and emergency preparedness programs. But, of course, as the basic data had already shown quite clearly, all these indices (percentages, in this instance) are much higher for all "training-type" categories than they are for the comparable categories with respect to their previous year's voluntary involvements. In fact, more than three times as many respondents with no previous training said that they would be willing to volunteer for EM-related activities and programs than did report voluntary work during the past 12 months, 69.3 percent in contrast with 21.1 percent!

Table 18 gives the data for the four major training patterns, that is, the four of the eight patterns (of Table 13) in which there are good numbers of cases.

Table 18

Training Patterns and Willingness to Volunteer

<u>Training Pattern</u>	<u>Willingness to Volunteer</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No*</u>
Health/war	83.5	5.5
Health/war/other	81.3	11.5
Health/other	79.5	11.0
Health only	78.4	12.4

\*Note: "Depends" percentages are not included here and this is why the two percentages tabulated do not add up to 100.

The willingness to volunteer for EM-related programs is thus essentially not different as a function of the previous training pattern at all. The only difference of note concerns the "unwillingness" responses: those with health and war related training past were less likely not to volunteer than were respondents in the remaining pattern categories. Interesting, though, this difference may be, it is not significant even in a statistical sense.

D. Training and Willingness to Be Trained

Most relevant, perhaps, is the relation between previous training experiences and expressed willingness to be trained or retrained in skills applicable to dealing with emergencies and disasters.

The percentages signifying willingness to be retrained or trained are obviously very high. Those who did not report previous disaster-related training experience are much less likely to be trained than are respondents who have had training. Those with prior training of the several types do not differ from each other in any significant respect. But even among those without any prior training, almost 70 percent of respondents expressed willingness to acquire knowledge and skills appropriate for dealing with disasters and emergencies. For these respondents, of course, it is most accurate to speak of "new training," while all those with any previous training, in effect, refer to "retraining" when they express their inclination to be trained.

Table 19

## Training Type and Willingness to Be Trained

<u>Prior Training Type</u>	<u>Willingness to be Trained</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Health-related	83.5	10.5
War-related	87.7	8.4
Other training	86.3	9.2
No training	68.0	20.4

Note: Respondents in the "depends" category not reported here explicitly, but the percentage base does include them.

Table 20 provides the relevant data for the four training types.

Table 20

## Training Patterns and Willingness to be Retrained

<u>Prior Training Pattern</u>	<u>Retraining Willingness</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Health/war	93.4	5.5
Health/other	89.8	7.1
Health/war/other	85.4	9.4
Health only	80.2	12.2

Note: "Depends" respondents on retraining willingness variable not explicitly included in the tabulation here, but the percentage base does include them.

Hence, over 93 percent of those with both some health- and war-related training express an inclination to be retrained, while "only" (!) 80 percent of those with solely health-related prior training do so. While this is a significant difference in its own right, it cannot be overemphasized that the "lowest" percentage in this expressed retraining willingness is of the order of 8 out of 10 people with prior (health only) training experiences.



### E. Timing of Prior Training and Training Willingness

In an intuitive sense, one might argue that willingness to be retrained in disaster and emergency related knowledge and skills is likely to be related, in some manner, to the time that has elapsed between the prior acquisition of such know-how and the intention to be retrained. More specifically, it would seem likely that people with the more recent training experience could think that retraining is less needed than would people whose training took place some, or even many, years ago.

This then suggests an hypothesis which postulates that the willingness to be retrained is the greater the more time has elapsed between "now" and the acquisition of the know-how by previous training. This hypothesis is essentially grounded in the idea of "felt need" for retraining: people trained some, or many, years ago have "more of a need" to be retrained than people trained rather recently. Indeed, it has to do with the simple fact that changes in knowledge and skill requirements may have rendered some prior training somewhat, if not altogether, obsolete. It is also based on the premise that many people may have partially forgotten their know-how, especially when they may not have put it to use for some time.

There is yet another way of looking at the possible relationship between the timing of previous training and the inclination to undergo some retraining.<sup>2</sup> There is, first of all, something that might be referred to as the "halo effect": the most recent trainees, assuming they benefited from their training and even liked it, are more likely to be still enjoying their experience and thus would have more of a tendency to be willing to partake of another training experience than people for whom the experience may have somewhat faded.

Second, there is the real possibility that some aspects of selective perception are operative as well: people with the more recent training might well be more attuned to follow media stories about events which involve the kinds of interventions for which they were trained, such as CPR. And this, of course, might have the effect of reenforcing their sense of satisfaction with having acquired some knowledge and skills that can help save lives or minimize the endangerment of health. Therefore, such people also might be more inclined to say that they would be prepared to be retrained than people for whom such events have become more routine if only because they acquired skills and knowledge relevant to them long ago (and thus have been also exposed to so many suchlike reports of events as to make them seem more routine).

Third, there may well be also something of the order of "available time effect": the pattern of daily life for most people does not change very dramatically over short periods of time. Thus the most recent trainees found time at their disposal to undergo the training which they received, and they would also be more likely to have such time available for retraining in the near future. For people who were trained some, or many, years ago the many changes in daily patterns of existence may well have created a situation in which time to invest into yet another training experience may not be, or may not seem to be, quite as available.

---

<sup>2</sup> Professor John Marx of the Department of Sociology at the University of Pittsburgh suggested some of these major alternative interpretations.

The age factor cuts into these types of considerations as well. Clearly, people who were trained some 10 or even 20 years ago have become 10 or 20 years older: they are, to be sure, in a basically different stage in their life cycle and "locked" into different patterns of social obligations than they were likely to have been 10 or 20 years ago.

All these lines of interpretations, of course, lead to an hypothesis which is just about the opposite of the speculation previously suggested: the more recent the training experience, the higher the willingness to be retrained.

Table 21 provides the data for respondents who claimed to have been trained in health-related knowledge and skills. Included are, of course, those people who may have been also involved in other training programs. Thus these are respondents who have levied a claim to at least some health-related skills acquired by training.

Table 21

Health Related Training and Willingness to Be Retrained

<u>Timing of Training</u>	Retraining Willingness	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1 year or less ago	90.7	6.6
2 to 5 years ago	87.4	7.5
6 to 10 years ago	86.8	8.3
11 or more years ago	56.2	27.4

Note: Those who said "depends" to the retraining willingness item not explicitly included here. The percentage base, however, does include them.

The data lend more of a support to the hypothesis that the recency of training experience is positively related to willingness to be trained again than to the alternative. But it is also quite clear that the key difference lies between those trained 10 or fewer years ago and those who reported that they acquired their health-related skills 11 or more years ago. Yet, a point to be repeated: among all respondents with prior health-related training and regardless when they were trained, the willingness to undergo retraining is quite high, and it is, of course, very high indeed among those were trained in the course of the past decade.

Table 22

## War Related Training and Willingness to be Retrained

<u>Timing of Training</u>	<u>Retraining Willingness</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1 year or less ago	93.4	3.3
2 to 5 years ago	90.0	10.0
6 to 10 years ago	91.4	8.6
11 or more years ago	77.4	12.9

Note: Those who said "depends" to the retraining willingness item excluded in tabulation but not in the percentaging base.

The war-related training experiences (radiological monitoring, shelter management, dealing with nuclear war) display a similar pattern to that of the health-related training backgrounds. Again, the key "break" in the data occurs between those trained 10 years or less ago and those who claimed to have acquired their knowledge and skills more than 10 years ago.

The willingness to be retrained, however, is higher for these respondents with war-related training background than it is for those health-related training. Among those with training experiences more than 10 years ago, the difference amounts to some 21 percent! In any event, however, all percentages of expressed willingness are so high, for both categories of respondents (health-related training as well as war-related training) as to lead to the unavoidable conclusion that by far most people trained in some disaster or emergency related skills, regardless of when they acquired their know-how, would be prepared to update their training if the opportunity presented itself.

What about people with training background, relevant to dealing with disasters and emergencies, who did not fall into the specific health-related or war-related categories but who did mention some "other" kind of appropriate training? The results are given in Table 23.

Needless to say: the pattern is the same as for those who cited health-related or war-related training backgrounds. And, once more, the sharp difference is between those whose training took place more than 10 years ago and those who were trained in the past 10 years. Also, and as previously, all the percentages referring to respondents claiming willingness to undergo further training are very high.

Table 23

## Other Disaster Related Training and Retraining Willingness

<u>Timing of Training</u>	<u>Retraining Willingness</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1 year or less ago	92.4	4.8
2 to 5 years ago	89.1	9.4
6 to 10 years ago	85.0	12.5
11 or more years ago	66.7	13.3

Note: The percentage base includes those who said "depends" regarding their retraining willingness. The percentage in this "depends" category is not presented in the tabulation.

In all then, the data provide considerable support for the hypothesis that the more recent the training experience, the greater the willingness to update one's training. Whether the "halo effect" or the "selective perception" dimension or the "time availability" factor provide the most plausible explanation cannot be ascertained. The fact remains, however, that such interpretive concerns, along with the aging effects, seem to be operative in inducing the major results. Furthermore, it is also rather clear that a 10 year interval appears to be, in some sense, quite critical: in each instance, the major difference lies between those whose training dates back more than 10 years and those who were trained, by their own assertions, in the past 10 years.

#### F. Community Self-Help and Household Self-Help

In the introduction to this report, it was suggested that volunteering for emergency related activities might involve self-help at the community level or, for that matter, at the household level. In the former instance, this involves activities in connection with other residents of the community and, basically, related to whatever institutionalized form of emergency management may exist. In the latter instance, it has to do with the acquisition, maintenance and even furtherance of knowledge and skills relevant to dealing with disasters and emergencies, but essentially for the benefit of the individual and, of course, the family (or household).

In each case, whether it has to do with community level self-help or what has been termed household level self-help, some training may be required so that the necessary know-how actually is available when needed.

This kind of a conceptualization yields a clue how it might be possible to look at the data in order to estimate whether particular respondents, and how many, seem more inclined to the community level self-help programs or to the household level self-help pattern.

1. Untrained people who are willing to be trained and willing to volunteer for disaster and emergency preparedness program are, in effect, saying that they are prepared to become involved in a community level self-help effort.
2. Untrained people who are willing to be trained but not willing to volunteer for community preparedness programs are, in a manner of speaking, saying that they would like to use their training at the household level - or, for that matter, for the benefit of relatives, friends, and close neighbors.
3. People with prior training who are willing to be retrained and are willing to volunteer for local disaster and emergency preparedness programs are similarly more in the community level self-help pattern.
4. Those with prior training who are willing to be retrained but not willing to participate, as volunteers, in the community's programs are, in turn, more oriented to preparedness at the household level.
5. Those with some prior training but unwilling (or unable?) to be retrained are, in effect, arguing that they do not need to update their training, cannot or, for whatever reasons, prefer not to do so. Among these respondents, those who are willing to volunteer for EM activities then seem to say that their past training remains adequate and that they would become involved at the community level of self-help efforts; of course, some are also (possibly) saying that they would become volunteers at the community level even if their past training experience were irrelevant or their know-how obsolete since they could, indeed, be volunteering for activities other than those for which their prior training may have equipped them.
6. Among respondents not previously trained and also unwilling (or unable?) to participate in training programs, those who say that they would, nonetheless, volunteer for disaster and emergency preparedness programs seem to suggest that they would be prepared to undertake whatever effort is needed by such programs and irrespective of their relative absence of skills and know-how appropriate in disaster and emergency situations.

What do the data indicate along such conceptual lines?

- Some 83.0 percent of those without prior training but willing to be trained are also willing to volunteer for EM types of community programs: in terms previously specified, they are community-oriented. They represent 18.2 percent of the total sample.
- Some 9.5 percent of those with prior training and with expressed willingness to become trained are not willing to become volunteers in a community EM effort: they might well be construed as household-oriented. In the sample as a whole, these respondents represent 2.1 percent of Americans.

- Among those who were trained and willing to be retrained, 84.9 percent are oriented to community level activities in that they are also prepared to volunteer for EM programs in general. They amount to 46.8 percent of the total sample (!).
- In turn, 7.8 percent of those with prior training and willingness to be updated would not be prepared to volunteer their time and effort for community EM programs. They are also, within the conceptual framework provided, more household- than community-oriented. They come to 4.3 percent of the sample.
- Untrained individuals and not intending to become trained are prepared to volunteer for community programs in 45.6 percent of the instances and they account for 2.9 percent of the sample.
- Trained individuals who do not express themselves willing to update their training would tend to volunteer at a rate of 51.1 percent (and this amounts to 3.6 percent of the sample). Their orientation, too, may be construed as community level interest.
- Finally, those with prior training but unwilling to be retrained yield a percentage of 17.8 of those who would be also unwilling to volunteer for community EM programs. Assuming that their disaster and emergency related know-how has not all but vanished or become altogether obsolete, they are more oriented to household level of activity as it has been specified previously. In the total sample, these individuals number 2.9 percent.

Overall then, some 68.6 percent of the sample in this inquiry tend to express an orientation to disasters and emergencies which places them into the "community" level concerns; more individual or household orientations are represented by 9.3 percent of the total sample. And there are an additional 2.9 percent who claim no prior training and would not be willing to be trained but would be likely to spend time and effort in voluntary work for community disaster and emergency preparedness programs.

These results, if anything, lean toward providing conservative estimates: they ignore those who may have said "depends" either to the item on willingness to be trained or retrained or the item on willingness to volunteer or, for that matter, to both of these items. The "depends" types of respondents certainly cannot be classified as saying "no" in terms of either willingness to be trained or retrained or to their volunteering intentions. Thus, in a practical sense, it is fair to conclude that many of these respondents would, under favorable circumstance, undertake training or retraining and would also be likely to volunteer for appropriate community disaster and emergency programs.

## G. Highlights

The major conclusions as they pertain to previous training experiences of the respondents may now be summed up:

1. People with some prior disaster and emergency related training are more likely to have served as volunteers than people without such training.
2. These previously trained respondents are also more inclined to become volunteers for preparedness programs in their communities than are people without prior training experiences.
3. The trained people are more likely to be willing to update their training, to be retrained, than are people without previous training.
4. But, regardless of training and the type of training, the willingness to volunteer; and the willingness to be trained or retrained is very high.
5. People trained in the past 10 years are substantially more likely to claim their intentions to become retrained than are people whose training experience dates back beyond the past decade; and this holds regardless of whether the previous training involved health-related or war-related or other types of training involvements.
6. Basically, the more recent the training experience the higher the willingness to be retrained.
7. By far, most respondents are oriented to volunteer service activities at the community rather than self help activities at the household level or on a more private level: these are respondents willing to volunteer for the community's disaster and emergency preparedness programs who were trained previously and willing to be updated in their know-how, those who had no prior training but would be prepared to be trained, and those who, with prior training, are unwilling to be retrained. Close to 70 percent of the sample fall into these categories.
8. Some 10 percent of the respondents appear to be more oriented to household, or private, level of self-help. Trained or untrained, these are people willing to be retrained or acquire new disaster related skills, though they are unwilling to volunteer for community programs; and they are also those trained people who are not willing to be retrained and updated and who are also unwilling to volunteer for community programs.
9. In each grouping (by training/absence of prior training and willingness/unwillingness to be retrained or trained), the percentages of those willing to serve as EM programs volunteers are very high indeed. Only among those who, trained or not previously trained, were unlikely to want to become trained or retrained are just about as many people not willing to volunteer for EM programs as there are respondents not prepared to do so.

The data on people with prior training who expressed their willingness to participate in training programs may, however, mask an important consideration which, given the information available, cannot really be empirically resolved: some, if not many, of these people may prefer to acquire, in the course of further training, skills and know-how other than that which they have already, at some time, been trained for. Thus it may be, in some or many instances, not so much a matter of "retraining," but actually of new training as well.

Be that as it may, there is, however, little doubt in light of the data that educational and training efforts which would enhance the knowledge and skills to cope effectively with emergencies and disasters appear to have considerable appeal. Any given training course is, of course, unlikely to attract the kinds of numbers of people that the data imply: not everyone willing to be trained is likely to view any and all such programs relevant, applicable or even interesting. It is not clear from the data which kinds of training programs would be appealing and to what segments of those desirous to be retrained or trained.

Similarly, on any given day and at any given time of the day, the potential numbers of those able to participate, even if otherwise altogether willing, cannot but represent a fraction of the total pool of those "interested." Yet, the very high levels of expressed willingness do suggest a major opportunity to advance the disaster and emergency coping capabilities by educational and training programs for members of the national public.





## VI. BACKGROUND FACTORS

### A. Some Baseline Considerations

In inquiries using the survey technique, it is altogether routine to ascertain some background, socio-cultural or demographic characteristics of the respondents. This, of course, is done so that it becomes possible to ask whether people who vary on some salient background trait(s) also vary in their responses to items central to the inquiry, or whether they actually are similar in their responses regardless of the particular socio-cultural characteristic.

Among the background factors explicitly considered here, and at this time, are included: the respondent's gender, racial background, age, marital status and the number of people in the household, education, household income, number of wage earners in the household, number of labor union members, religious preference and self-evaluated religiosity.

So the questions, at this stage of the analysis quite simple ones, are of the following kind: Do women and men differ, or are they alike, in their evaluations of possible community self-help programs; in their willingness to volunteer for programs of disaster and emergency preparedness; in their willingness to be trained or retrained in some skills pertinent to the dealing with emergencies and disasters? The questions then, of course, have the same essential, and to repeat, simple, format with respect to each of the background characteristics.

### B. Gender

1. The idea of community self-help efforts is somewhat more appealing to women than to men (the index values are 63.0 and 59.2 respectively).
2. Women are also giving somewhat higher rating (56.7) to the effectiveness of local emergency management programs than do the men (51.6) and, similarly, to Federal program effectiveness (the index being 49.1 for women and 45.6 for men).
3. Women have been slightly more involved in voluntary activities in the course of the previous year than were men (35.8 percent compared with 33.4 percent).
4. More women (81.5 percent) than men (78.5 percent) expressed their willingness to be trained or retrained in disaster-related skills and know-how.
5. Women, once again, somewhat more than men (77.9 percent contrasted with 75.7 percent respectively) claimed their willingness to volunteer for community disaster preparedness programs.

In themselves, none of these differences between men and women are particularly striking and certainly none are "dramatic." But the pattern accounts for the substantive significance of the

result: quite consistently, women are more disposed, if only slightly so, to the kinds of activities which involve ways of coping with disasters and emergencies.

There are, however, no real differences in the overriding tendency of all respondents, and thus regardless of gender: the idea of self-help gets a higher rating than does the perceived effectiveness of local disaster related activities which, in turn, is rated as better (more effective) than are Federal programs. Similarly, the existing voluntary involvements, the willingness to volunteer and the inclination to be trained or retrained generate very high percentages in the positive categories for men and women alike.

### C. Racial Background

Some caution is in order: blacks are somewhat under-represented in the sample (5.6 percent); and the estimates are thus more likely to be less robust than are the data for whites. Here, the few Hispanics who fell into the sample are omitted from considerations since there are, indeed, simply too few cases on which to base any estimation. This is also the case with respondents of other, such as Asian/Oriental backgrounds. The term "whites" as it is used here then is applicable to respondents who reported to be "white," but other than of Hispanic heritage.

1. Whites more than blacks rate local program effectiveness higher (55.9 and 42.4 are the corresponding index values) as they do the effectiveness of Federal programs (48.2 compared with 44.0).
2. More than blacks (whose index value is 54.3), the white respondents (with an index of 62.5) find the idea of community self-help programs appealing.
3. In the past years, blacks and whites reported voluntary activities at just about the same rate (35.1 percent for blacks, 34.8 percent for whites).
4. But more than whites (76.1 percent), the black respondents (87.8 percent) expressed their willingness to be trained or retrained, and they were (93.2 percent) more willing to volunteer for community disaster and emergency programs than were the whites (79.5 percent).

Thus black Americans view the effectiveness of both local and Federal programs somewhat lower than do the whites, and they find the idea of self-help efforts also less appealing than do their white counterparts but, at the same time, they are more inclined to express their willingness to undergo training as well as to volunteer for emergency and disaster preparedness programs. And they reported about the same level of prior voluntary service as did the white respondents.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> It may seem like a contradiction that the self-help concept seems somewhat less supported by the blacks but they, at the same time, are inclined to volunteer more. It must be recalled that the item seeking an evaluation of the self-help concept stipulated that these are programs at the community level which involve no

#### D. Age

In the study, detailed data on respondent's age are available: in fact, in terms of the year of birth. To simplify the analysis here, five age groupings were generated:<sup>2</sup> those in the 18 to 24 year bracket, those 25 to 34 years old, 35 to 49 year olds, those between 50 and 64, and, finally, respondents 65 years of age and older.

1. There is a tendency for the effectiveness ratings of local EM programs to increase with increasing age. Thus the rating index yields a value of 50.2 for the youngest category of respondents (18-24), 52.4 for the next grouping (25-34), 55.0 for those in the 35-49 years bracket, 57.9 for the 50-64 year olds and 57.0 for those 65 years of age and older.
2. In the assessment of the effectiveness of Federal programs, the differences are quite small, with the oldest grouping (65 years and older) giving the highest relative rating (49.6) and the age category just below that (50 to 64 years) the lowest rating (44.5).
3. By contrast, the relative appeal of the concept volunteer service at the community level is the lower the higher the age. The index values decline consistently, though again, even when the extreme groupings are considered, the youngest and the oldest, the difference is a small one. From the youngest to the oldest categories, the indices are 63.7, 63.5, 62.2, 59.6 and 58.6.
4. Respondents in the 35-49 and 50-64 age categories reported more voluntary activity in the past year (37.6 percent and 36.8 percent respectively) than did other respondents, with those 65 years and older claiming least involvement in "past year's" volunteering (27.5 percent).
5. The willingness to be trained or retrained is highest in the youngest age categories (88.4 among the 18-24 year olds and 90.5 percent among those in the 25-34 year age bracket) and then it tends to decline with age (87.0 percent among those 35-49 years of age, 73.6 percent in the 50-64 year grouping, and 45.0 percent in the category of oldest respondents).
6. Willingness to volunteer for EM types of preparedness programs declines with increasing age. The percentages, from the youngest to the oldest grouping are: 87.1, 80.2, 77.6, 74.0 and 65.

Government funding at all, while volunteering for emergency and disaster preparedness programs evokes participation in existing activities at the local Governmental level where such activities are vested.

<sup>2</sup> The availability of detailed age data, of course, also means that other groupings can be constructed as needed or as appropriate.

In summary, if somewhat simplified, terms: older respondents think somewhat better of the effectiveness of existing local programs than do younger respondents, but they are less impressed by the idea of self-help, they have done less voluntary work and are less likely to undergo further training or retraining and to volunteer for EM programs. The pattern is particularly true about the oldest category of respondents, 65 years of age and older, among who the lower percentages of expressed "willingness" cannot be generally construed as "unwillingness" but often as inability due to age itself or its coupling with health and other (low income, for instance) problems.

#### E. Marital Status

1. The basic pattern in assessments of emergency preparedness effectiveness holds regardless of marital status: thus single as well as married respondents, the divorced and separated as well as widowed interviewees give higher ratings to the effectiveness of community programs than to Federal programs, and the idea of self-help efforts yields consistently even higher index values than does the assessment of existing community programs.
2. Though the differences are but subtle, single and married people express lower satisfaction with both community and Federal emergency management programs than do other respondents (divorced, separated, widowed). For single respondents (N=336), for instance, the community effectiveness index is 53.2, while it is 58.6 among the widowed respondents (N=107); the evaluation of Federal programs leads to values of 46.9 and 51.0 for these two groups respectively.
3. In turn, single respondents (index value of 63.9) are somewhat more impressed by the self-help concept than are the married (index of 60.9), the divorced and separated (60.9) or widowed (60.3).
4. The widowed respondents, 31.1 percent, and 28.6 among the divorced and separated ones represent lower rates of volunteering in the course of the past years than the rates reported by married (35.7 percent) and single (35.2 percent) respondents.
5. Single and married respondents (with percentages of 86.9 and 81.4) were more likely to claim their willingness to undergo emergency related training (or retraining) than were the divorced and separated (78.1 percent) and much more so than the widowed respondents (50.0 percent).
6. With respect to expressed willingness to volunteer for disaster preparedness programs, only the widowed respondents tend to yield a lower percentage, though it is still very high, than do others.
  - Single respondents - 78.5 percent
  - Married respondents - 77.9 percent

- Divorced and separated respondents - 77.1 percent, and
- Widowed respondents - 65.4 percent.

Thus, single, married as well as divorced respondents are most probable candidates for participation in appropriate self-help activities related to disaster and emergency preparedness and these respondents, of course, constitute by far the largest segments of the population. In the sample, the singles constitute 24.1 percent, and the married 61.9 percent, of the total.

#### F. Size of Household

1. There are, in effect, no differences of note in the evaluations of community as well as Federal program effectiveness among respondents living in households of varying (reported) sizes. The community effectiveness index indicates, as before, a rating of "somewhat better than good" (somewhat over 50 in terms of the index value), and it exceeds 55 (with a value of 56.7) only among respondents living alone (N=226). The Federal programs rating, typically "somewhat worse than good" (with index values in the higher 40's) has its lowest value (45.7) among respondents in large households (5 or more persons, N=202).
2. The idea of community self-help is appreciated most by single person households (index of 63.5), while the index is just around 61 for respondents from households of other sizes.
3. Involvement in previous year's volunteering turns out to be highest in the largest households, those with five or more residents: 46.5 percent of them reported such activities. The percentage is the lowest (29.7 percent) in two-person households, and it lies between 33 and 36 percent for those in single-person, three- and four-person households.
4. The larger the household, the greater the willingness to participate in training or retraining programs. The percentages go from 67.0 (one-person household) to 77.5 (two-person) to 83.1 (three-person) to 87.5 (four-person) and in the largest households 88.0 percent claimed that they would be prepared to undergo emergency related training.
5. There are also differences in expressions of willingness to volunteer for community disaster preparedness programs: the pattern is somewhat different from that regarding propensities to participate in training, though the lowest volunteering willingness (67.0 percent) is also the response of one-person households. Here, however, the highest percentage (83.0) is among those in three-person households, and the next highest (82.3 percent) among respondents in four-person households. The data show inclination to volunteer on the part of 78.4 percent of those in the largest households, and 74.5 percent in the two-person households.

## G Income

The study instrument provided for a number of income categories (brackets). For the purposes of this analysis, the data were grouped into four major categories: those earning less than \$10,000, those with reported incomes between \$10,000 and (less than) \$25,000, those with earnings between \$25,000 and (less than) \$40,000 and, finally, the respondents with annual incomes of \$40,000 or more.

1. There are no differences by reported approximate household income in the ratings assigned to both community and Federal emergency and disaster preparedness programs.
2. The idea of self-help activities is rated somewhat higher by the higher income earners: the index has a value of 62.3 among those with incomes of \$40,000 or more, and it is 63.1 among respondents in the \$25,000 to \$40,000 bracket. Among those with earnings of less than \$10,000 per annum, the index is 60.6, and its value is 60.7 for those with incomes between \$10,000 and \$25,000.
3. Essentially: the higher the income the greater the likelihood of having reported participation in voluntary activities in the course of the previous year. The highest participation rate (40.1 percent) characterized respondents with earnings between \$25,000 and \$40,000; the lowest rate of participation was among the respondents with the lowest earnings (less than \$10,000 per year): 25.6 percent of them mentioned some volunteering effort.
4. The same basic pattern is reflected in the data on willingness to volunteer for disaster related programs: 81.0 percent of respondents with earnings between \$25,000 and \$40,000 stated their positive intentions (N=421, the modal category in terms of the income distribution); 75.8 percent stated their willingness among those with incomes exceeding \$40,000 (N=343) and the percentage was 75.6 percent and 74.0 percent for respondents with incomes between \$10,000 and \$25,000 and those with less than \$10,000 yearly.
5. The higher the income, the greater the readiness to participate in training and retraining programs:
  - 71.3 percent of respondents (N=129) with less than \$10,000 incomes expressed their willingness to be trained;
  - Among those with earnings of \$10,000 to \$25,000, 76.3 percent said so;
  - 83.2 percent of respondents with incomes of \$25,000 to \$40,000 were prepared to undergo training or retraining, and
  - 88.2 percent of respondents in the highest income category (\$40,000 or more) were similarly inclined.

## H. Number of Wage Earners

Some 12.0 percent of the respondents reported that there was no wage earner, currently, in the household. In 37.2 percent of the households there was one wage earner and in 39.7 percent two wage earners. Three or more employed residents were reported in 11.1 percent of the households.

1. Community disaster preparedness programs rate slightly better (with an index value of 58.6) in households with no wage earners than in other households (with typical values around 54.0).
2. Federal programs were rated in their effectiveness essentially in the same manner by the respondents regardless of the number of wage earners in the household.
3. The idea of self-help was just about equally appealing to all four "number of wage earner" groupings.
4. The greater the number of wage earners in the household, the higher the rate of previous year's volunteering involvements:
  - 29.0 percent reported some voluntary activity in households without any wage earner;
  - In households with one member as the income producer, the volunteering rate was 33.8 percent;
  - Households with two wage earners yielded a 35.7 percent volunteering rate;
  - In households with three or more wage earners, the volunteering claims amounted to 40.8 percent.
5. The willingness to participate in training/retraining programs related to disaster preparedness was lowest, and relatively low indeed, in the households with no (current) wage earners: 55.0 percent. In all other households, the percentage exceeded 80.0 and it was 87.5 percent in households with two employed persons.
6. Similarly, the lowest percentage (65.9 percent) of those willing to volunteer their time and effort for community disaster preparedness programs was found among respondents with no wage earner in the household.
  - In residences with two wage earners, the volunteering willingness rate was 80.3 percent;
  - In households with more than two wage earners, it was 79.5 percent;
  - And in households with one wage earner, 76.8 percent.



It is certainly fair to say that, on balance, households in which no one is employed and earning wages or salaries, though this probably would not hold for female headed households with young children where the mother's time is, if anything, at a minimum. But it is precisely in these households in which the inclination toward voluntary participation is the lowest. Yet, of course, even the lowest percentages remain rather high so the result must be interpreted in the light of the prevailing and dominant tendencies to express strong willingness to participate - whether in training and retraining activities or in general emergency and disaster preparedness programs.

#### I. Labor Union Membership

For the purposes of this analysis, the distinction is made only between households (80.6 percent of all) with no labor/trade union member(s) and those with at least one such member.

1. In households with no labor union members, both community and Federal program effectiveness receives a slightly higher rating.
2. The concept of self-help, rated again higher than the effectiveness of existing community or Federal programs, yields essentially identical indices in both groups: 61.8 in households with no union membership and 60.7 in households with one or more members in organized labor.
3. Households with at least one member in the unions reported slightly more volunteering in the course of the previous year (36.2 percent) than did households with no union member(s) (34.4 percent).
4. There is no difference between households with or without union member(s) in either the willingness to participate in training or retraining programs or in the propensity to volunteer for community disaster preparedness programs in general.

#### J. Education

Although more detailed data on formal educational experience are available, only three major groupings are used in this analysis: people with completed high school education or less, a category which also includes those who said that they had attended technical schools; people with some, but incomplete, college experience; and those with college degrees or with formal education beyond the first college degree.

1. The indices providing information about the evaluation of effectiveness of community and Federal emergency and disaster programs yield similar values regardless of the level of formal education. Invariably, the community programs are rated somewhat more effective than are Federal programs.

2. The self-help concept receives a somewhat lower mark (the index value is 58.8) among respondents with high school or less education than among people with some college background (index of 64.2) or with college or more schooling (index of 64.1).
3. The higher the educational attainment the greater the reported rate of voluntary activities in the past year:
  - For those with high school or less education, the volunteering rate was 26.5 percent;
  - For respondents with some college background, it was 38.2 percent;
  - For the formally most educated respondents, the participation in previous year's volunteering was 44.5 percent.
4. The higher the education, the greater the tendency to be willing to undergo training or retraining: for the three educational groupings, the percentages were 76.8, 82.2 and 84.5 respectively.
5. Though, of course, all the percentages are very high indeed, the willingness to volunteer for disaster preparedness programs was relatively lowest among the most educated (75.7 percent, N=448) highest among those with some, but not complete, college education (78.2 percent, N=289), and it was 77.7 percent among respondents with the least formal schooling (N=631).

#### K. Religious Preference

There are not enough cases in the study to permit a detailed differentiation by religious preferences of some of the respondents. To be sure, the sample includes many Protestants and Roman Catholics, but rather few others. Thus for the purposes of analysis, respondents with "other than" either Protestant or Roman Catholic preference were grouped together as "Other." With some 180 respondents claiming no religious affiliation, this category was left as a separate one.

In effect then, the comparisons here concern Protestants, Roman Catholics, those with religious affiliations "other than" either Protestant or Catholic, and those without any reported religious preference.

1. The effectiveness rating of community disaster programs is higher for Protestants and Catholics (index values of 56.1 and 56.5 respectively) than for "Others" (index of 50.6) and for those without a religious affiliation (index of 51.5).

2. Federal programs are rated similarly by Catholics, Protestants and "Others" while their lowest rating (index value of 44.1) occurs on the part of people without a religious preference.
3. The idea of self-help activities has an essentially similar appeal across these religious groupings. Protestants (index of 61.3) and those without a religious affiliation (index value of 59.1) are very slightly less sanguine about the idea than are Catholics (index of 63.2) or "Others" (index of 63.3).
4. People with "other than" Protestant or Catholic preference reported a higher volunteering rate in the previous year (41.4 percent) than did either Catholics (36.4 percent) or Protestants (33.6 percent). Respondents without a religious preference claimed volunteering in 31.4 percent of the instances.
5. As for willingness to be trained or retrained or, for that matter, disposition to volunteer for disaster preparedness programs, the differences are also rather subtle:
  - People with "other than" Protestant or Catholic preference were most likely to volunteer (80.2 percent), and 80.0 percent of them were also willing to participate in training programs.
  - 76.1 percent of the Roman Catholics would be inclined to become volunteers, and 82.6 percent of them indicated their willingness to be trained or retrained.
  - Among the respondents with "no" religious preference, 83.1 percent would be willing to be trained, and 74.0 percent would be likely to volunteer their effort for community emergency preparedness programs.
  - 77.7 percent of the Protestants indicated their inclination to volunteer, and 79.0 percent their willingness to partake of training or retraining programs.

Quite a few of the respondents classified as "Others" here are adherents of Judaism. All studies of volunteering indicate that Americans of Jewish background tend to participate somewhat more than do people of other religious preferences and of other ethnic backgrounds. While the rather small number of Jewish respondents in the sample does not permit a firm conclusion, it is rather probable that the high propensity of "other than" Protestants or Catholics both to participate in training programs and to volunteer for community disaster preparedness programs results from such tendencies on the part of Jewish respondents.

Yet, of course, religious preference in these broadly conceived terms does not "produce" any sharp differences in perceptions and attitudes explored in this particular inquiry.

## L. Religiosity

Religious affiliations are certainly not exactly the same thing as is the strength of religious feelings. This variable, that of "religiosity," was included as a separate item. The respondents were asked to say how strongly religious they were. The response categories included: very strongly, strongly, moderately, not so strongly and not strongly at all. In all, some 39.9 percent of the respondents claim that they were "very strongly" religious; 28.3 were "strongly" but not very strongly religious; 20.9 percent were but "moderately" religious, and 7.3 percent reported that they were "not so strongly religious." Finally, those who were, by their own reports, essentially not religious at all amounted to 3.5 percent of the sample.

1. The stronger the religiosity, the more favorable the evaluation of effectiveness of community disaster programs and also the more favorable the evaluation of Federal programs:
  - Among the "very strongly religious" respondents, the community program rating index has a value of 56.9, and the Federal programs yield an index of 49.1.
  - Among the "strongly" religious, the respective indices are 54.6 and 47.7.
  - Respondents with reporting to be "moderately" religious the two indices have values of 52.3 and 48.0 respectively.
  - For those who were "not so strongly religious," the index values turn out to be 52.2 and 42.7.
  - Finally, among respondents evaluating their religiosity as very low (if any at all), the indices were 42.2 and 40.4.
2. The stronger the religiosity, the higher the support for the idea of "self-help" programs. From those "very strongly religious" to those essentially "not religious" at all, the indices display the following pattern: 62.4, 61.5, 61.4, 60.9, and 51.1. In effect, of course, this means that the assessment of self-help concepts is just about as high regardless of religiosity except for those respondents (3.5 percent of the sample) who were basically not religious at all.
3. The most secular respondents, the least religious, were most likely to have reported previous year's voluntary activities (40.9 percent). Beyond that, the stronger the claimed religiosity, the higher the rate of volunteering: 37.5 percent among the "very strongly religious," 35.9 percent among the "strongly religious," 33.8 percent among the "moderately religious" and 27.5 percent among those with but weak religiosity.
4. Only among respondents whose religiosity, by their own reports, was rather weak does the percentage of those willing to participate in training/retraining programs fall below 80.0 percent: it is, actually, 76.4 percent. For all other groups, the percentage is above 80.0 percent; and there are, in fact, no differences in terms of strength of religious feeling.

5. In principle, the stronger the religiosity the greater the tendency to volunteer for community disaster preparedness programs. Some 78.9 percent among the "very strongly religious" would volunteer; 69.8 percent among those reporting essentially no religious sentiments. The pattern breaks down only in that respondents who were "moderately religious" yielded the second lowest percentage, high though it is anyway (74.3 percent).

There is little doubt about the implications of these types of findings: people who are rather deeply religious are more likely to be involved in the kinds of programs which they feel may benefit their communities; and, at the same time, most people tend to claim to be rather religious - only about 11 percent altogether fall into the "weak" or "no" religiosity categories.

#### M. Highlights

What might be said about the results in summary form? A sketch of the prevailing tendencies follows:

1. In no population segment<sup>3</sup> do we find deviation from the dominant views:
  - The effectiveness of community disaster and emergency preparedness/management programs is rated higher than the perceived effectiveness of Federal programs.
  - The idea of self-help consistently has ratings that exceed those of the existing community programs.
  - In verbal terms<sup>4</sup> the concept of community self-help efforts is close to being rated, on the average, as a "very good" idea, the effectiveness of community programs is seen as "somewhat better than good," and the effectiveness of Federal programs as "somewhat worse than good."
  - Prior year's volunteering reports never fall below 20 percent for any demographic segment of the population.
  - Intentions to participate in training and retraining programs as well as willingness to volunteer for community disaster preparedness efforts always exceed 50 percent of the

---

<sup>3</sup> The term "segment" refers to a portion of the sample that is homogeneous on some specified background/demographic/socio-cultural characteristics. "Women" or "people earning \$25,000 to \$40,000" or "very strongly religious" respondents are examples of such "segments."

<sup>4</sup> Qualitative ratings from "excellent" to "poor" were obtained in the course of the interview. These were transformed into numeric indices throughout.

respondents and are, in fact, most generally of the order of three quarters of the respondents.

2. Hence, the principal finding reflects robust homogeneity of the population in their perceptions of community and Federal programs effectiveness, in their assessment of the possible value of self-help activities at the community level, in volunteering history, in willingness to partake of training/retraining as well as in their willingness to volunteer time and effort for the community's disaster and emergency management programs.
3. Women are slightly more inclined to volunteer than men and the idea of self-help is also slightly more appealing to them.
4. The self-help notion is somewhat more appealing to whites than to blacks, but black Americans, unfortunately a bit under-represented in the sample (6.0 percent, so some caution is required) are more likely to volunteer as well as to undergo training or retraining in disaster related programs.
5. Younger people more than older ones, and especially more than the elderly of 65 years of age and over, find the self-help idea more promising and they are also more inclined to volunteer for disaster preparedness programs.
6. Single and married respondents rate self-help higher than do the divorced, separated, and widowed respondents, and they are also more likely to participate in voluntary efforts at the community level, both with regard to willingness to be trained and to more general disaster-related activities.
7. Respondents living by themselves think somewhat better of the self-help concepts than do others; but the willingness to participate in training programs is the greater the larger the household size, and volunteering willingness is the highest in households with three or four persons.
8. The self-help concept finds strongest resonance among higher income households than in others, and the higher the income the greater the likelihood of participation in training programs. Respondents in higher income households are also most inclined to volunteer their time and effort, with those in the \$25,000 to \$40,000 category indicating the strongest propensity to do so.
9. Least, though still strong, participation can be expected from respondents in households in which there is no wage earner (at least at the time of the study).
10. People in households with one or more labor union members react just about the same way as do respondents in household in which no one is a member of organized labor.
11. The more formally educated respondents, with some college background or more, are more likely to participate in voluntary activities than are respondents with less formal educational backgrounds.

12. There are no differences to note between Protestants and Roman Catholics. Respondents of religious preference "other than Protestant or Catholic" (many of them Jewish but not enough of them in the sample to be analyzed separately) are most likely to participate both in training programs and in community volunteering.
13. The stronger the religiosity, the greater the likelihood of involvement, and the more support is given to the self-help idea. But also respondents who claim not to be religious at all are quite likely to volunteer for community preparedness programs.

Perhaps it cannot be sufficiently emphasized that the differences between and among the various demographic segments of the population are but subtle ones. The key pattern is one of national consensus: the idea of self-help is just about a "very good" one; the expressed willingness to undergo training or retraining is very high and so is the willingness to work as a volunteer in community disaster preparedness and management programs.

## VII. SETTINGS

### A. Some Basic Considerations

It is, perhaps, trivial to say that people live in different parts of the country. The sample, of course, reflects this variability in the nesting of the respondents. Information acquired in the course of this (telephone) survey permits an easy identification of the county of residence of each of the interviewees.

Some respondents live in less populous counties. Others, in counties with a large population. To what extent, if any at all, might there be variation in reactions to community and Federal disaster preparedness programs "as a function" of the population size of the counties in which the respondents reside? To what extent might there be differences in the evaluation of the worthwhileness of the self-help concept, in prior volunteering experiences, in willingness to be trained/retrained or in willingness to become a volunteer for community programs of disaster preparedness?

To address these issues, the respondents were categorized into four basic groups dependent on the population size in their respective counties.

- 26.6 percent live in counties, the least populous ones, with fewer than 50,000 people.
- 10.5 percent turn out to reside in counties with a population of 50,000 to (less than) 250,000.
- 27.3 percent inhabit counties where there are at least 250,000 people but fewer than 1,000,000.
- The remaining 35.5 percent are in counties with a population of 1,000,000 or more.

These broad groupings are used here to explore the similarities and differences in public views on the questions on which this report focuses.

It is, quite similarly, altogether pertinent to ask the same kinds of questions with regard to the various major regions of the country. For the purposes of this analysis, the regions were defined in terms of the administrative regions as used by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. There are ten such regions:

- 5.5 percent of the respondents reside in (FEMA) Region I (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont).
- 9.3 percent are in Region II (New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, but there are no data in this study from the latter two areas in this Region).



- In Region III (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia and West Virginia), there are 11.2 of the respondents.
- Region IV (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee) is the residence of 17.0 percent of the respondents.
- 23.1 percent live in Region V (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin).
- Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas form the administrative Region VI, and 10.2 percent of the interviewees reside there.
- In Region VII (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska), there are 6.8 percent of the respondents.
- 3.9 percent live in Region VIII (Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming).
- In Region IX (Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Samoa, Guam and the Trust Territories), there are 8.8 percent of the respondents but no data were acquired from Hawaii, Samoa, Guam or the Trust Territories in this study.
- Finally, 4.1 percent of the interviewees reside in Region X (Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, but there are no data in this study from Alaska).

The single most impressive finding with regard to individual and household "background factors," as in the previous section of the paper, indicates a pattern of consensus, of homogeneity across the nation regardless of the more specific characteristics of the respondents and their households. Some differences, of course, exist but they are consistently rather minor ones even though they display a degree of orderliness which cannot, and was not, neglected.

To what extent is there such homogeneity in the public views when one considers the population size of their counties of residence or the administrative region in which they live? To what extent are there differences that merit attention? These then are the central questions in this, and final, analytic exploration.

#### B. Size of Population

The data of Table 24 show only small differences in the evaluations of effectiveness of either community or Federal disaster and emergency management programs.

Table 24

## Views On Community and Federal Program Effectiveness

<u>County Population</u>	<u>Effectiveness Indices</u>	
	<u>Community</u>	<u>Federal</u>
Less than 50,000	53.3	46.6
50,000 < 250,000	55.8	46.4
250,000 < 1,000,000	57.1	48.2
1,000,000 or more	53.4	48.3

In the least and most populous counties, community programs are thus seen as slightly less effective than is the case in the "middle" two categories of counties. Federal programs, in turn, are slightly more appreciated in the two more populous types of counties than in the two less populous ones. But again, as has been shown throughout, the relative rating of community programs exceeds the rating of Federal efforts regardless of the population size of the county of respondent's residence.

In the least and most populous counties, the idea of self-help is slightly less attractive than it is in counties with a population between 50,000 and 1,000,000.

- The index has a value of 58.9 in the least populous counties.
- It has a value of 61.0 in counties with 1,000,000 or more residents.
- In counties in the 50,000 < 250,000 bracket, the index value comes to 63.1.
- The index has a value of 64.4 among respondents who live in counties with 250,000 < 1,000,000 residents.

Self-help efforts are thus seen as "quite good" regardless of the population size of areas of the residences of the study respondents.

The data in Table 25 shed light on the volunteering experiences as well as propensities of the respondents.

Table 25

## Volunteering Claims and Intentions

<u>County Population</u>	P e r c e n t a g e s		
	<u>Last Year's Volunteers</u>	<u>Participation Training</u>	<u>Willingness Volunteer</u>
Less than 50,000	35.0	78.1	79.2
50,000 < 250,000	30.5	75.7	73.6
250,000 < 1,000,000	33.9	80.2	76.5
1,000,000 or more	36.6	83.5	76.7

The results certainly reveal no major differences. In the least and most populous counties, prior year's volunteering rates are somewhat higher than they are in the two other groups of counties. In the two most populous contexts of the respondents, the willingness to be trained somewhat exceeds that shown by interviewees in the less populous counties. And willingness to volunteer for the community's disaster preparedness programs is higher in the least populous counties.

Among residents living in counties with 50,000 but fewer than 250,000 residents, the data suggest consistently somewhat less previous volunteering, a slightly lesser inclination to participate in training/retraining programs and also a slightly less propensity for volunteering for programs of disaster and emergency preparedness. But, of course, the difference (though a consistent one) is only a small one, and the reported claims remain at a very high level indeed.

C. Regions

The data of Table 26 indicate regional variation in public assessments of effectiveness of community and Federal disaster preparedness programs. These, to repeat, are administrative regions in use by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and a number of other Federal Government departments and agencies at this time.

Both community and Federal programs get their highest effectiveness ratings in Region X (for which the study has some data from Oregon, Washington and Idaho only, to the exclusion of Alaska). The lowest marks on effectiveness of both community and Federal programs result from responses of interviewees in Region I and the ratings are also relatively low in Region IX.

Table 26

## Regional Views on Community and Regional Program Effectiveness

<u>Region</u>	<u>Effectiveness Indices</u>	
	<u>Community</u>	<u>Federal</u>
Region I	49.0	41.0
Region II	55.8	48.1
Region III	57.4	47.7
Region IV	53.3	49.9
Region V	55.8	48.1
Region VI	56.7	49.0
Region VII	55.8	46.0
Region VIII	51.2	45.1
Region IX	62.0	50.4
Region X		
<hr/>		
National Average	54.6	47.6
<hr/>		

But again: in all Regions, community efforts are assigned higher ratings than are Federal programs, the smallest difference in this regard occurring in Region IV. Here, the evaluations of community programs is, compared with other Regions, relatively low (and below the national average), while the rating of Federal activities is second highest (with a value of 49.9) to Region X (with its index value of 50.4).

Thus the indices are below the national average on community programs in Regions I, IX and IV, and they fall below the nation's average in Regions I, IX, VII and VIII when it comes to assessments of Federal program effectiveness.

Table 27 shows that the self-help concept yields indices which are more homogeneous than are the corresponding evaluations of either community or Federal programs, relative to which the differences between the extremes are rather sharp. The findings also replicate a conclusion to which no exception has been found across the spectrum of analytic foci: the self-help idea has, in each and every Region, ratings higher than those assigned to the effectiveness of community programs (which, again with similar consistency, always "rate" better than do Federal programs).

Table 27

## Perceived Effectiveness of Self-help

<u>Region</u>	<u>Perceived Self-help Effectiveness</u>
Region I	63.3
Region II	65.2
Region III	57.9
Region IV	62.3
Region V	60.4
Region VI	60.9
Region VII	60.4
Region VIII	66.4
Region IX	60.5
Region X	66.5
<hr/>	
National average	61.6
<hr/>	

Now if the regional findings on community and Federal program effectiveness as well as the indices on possible effectiveness of self-help efforts at the community level are "anchored" in the national averages, seven major patterns (out of eight possible ones) emerge. This "anchoring" simply means that the results for each Region may be viewed as yielding index values "above" or "below" the nation's average. The patterns are displayed in Table 28.

Table 28

## Effectiveness Indices Relative to National Average

<u>Pattern</u>	<u>Effectiveness Relative to National Average</u>			<u>Regions</u>
	<u>Community</u>	<u>Federal</u>	<u>Self-help</u>	
A	Above	Above	Above	II, X
B	Above	Above	Below	III, V, VI
C	Above	Below	Above	VIII
D	Above	Below	Below	VII
E	Below	Above	Above	IV
F	Below	Below	Above	I
G	Below	Below	Below	IX

Some rather bold interpretations seem suggested by the results, provided that it is recognized that the "analytic anchorage" (in terms of "national averages") is not necessarily in any way isomorphic to the actual rationale for the responses obtained from respondents from the respective regions. This means, above all, that there is no factual reason to assume, and perhaps many reasons not to assume), that people can somehow have a sense of "national" patterns of effectiveness to which, in turn, they might be comparing the relative effectiveness of their community's programs or the effectiveness of Federal activities. Yet, even subject to such conceptual limitations, there may well be a kind of "interpretive story" to be told.

1. Pattern A (above the national average on all three indices) seems to say: community programs are quite good, and Federal programs are fairly good; self-help efforts might further strengthen the community disaster response capabilities. (Regions II, X)
2. Pattern B, in turn, suggests that community and Federal programs are reasonably effective as is, and while self-help types of efforts might be worthwhile, they are not "essential." (Regions III, V, VI)
3. Pattern C indicates that community efforts are quite good though Federal programs leave something to be desired, and self-help activities could enhance the quality of community disaster preparedness programs. (Region VIII)
4. Pattern D is suggestive of the notion that community programs are quite adequate (although Federal efforts are not quite up to par) and self-help might not be (greatly) needed to augment the local capabilities. (Region VII)
5. Pattern E says, in effect, that community programs are not altogether adequate, that Federal activities are, on the whole, better than they generally (nationally) are, and that self-help types of involvements might well make local programs more adequate. (Region IV)
6. Pattern F (Region I), in effect, indicates that both community and Federal programs are not quite what they might be, and that the self-help idea is quite a good one, perhaps to provide an alternative to government sponsored programs at the local level.
7. Finally, Pattern G (Region IX) yields lower than average ratings on all three indices: both community programs and Federal programs are less adequate or appropriate than they seem elsewhere in the country, and self-help efforts might not do a great deal to enhance the disaster and emergency preparedness capabilities.

These interpretations, of course, must not obscure the major, and repeated, point: self-help forms of public involvement in community disaster preparedness programs is viewed as a rather good idea everywhere. At the same time, it can be seen as complementing already rather good local programs or, alternatively, as a kind of substitute, or augmentation, for programs that are considered to be good but not really quite adequate.

There are significant regional differences in rates of reported (previous year's) volunteering (Table 29). In Regions VIII and X suggest that almost one out of every two residents has served as a volunteer. In Region IV, the rate is lower than that of the highest Region VIII by a factor of 1.68 (46.6 percent compared with 27.8 percent).

Table 29  
Previous Year's Volunteering Reports

<u>Region</u>	<u>Percent Volunteers</u>
Region I	34.7
Region II	36.3
Region III	38.9
Region IV	27.8
Region V	32.4
Region VI	32.4
Region VII	36.6
Region VIII	46.6
Region IX	38.7
Region X	45.6
<hr/>	
National average	34.7

Regions IV, V and VI are below the national volunteering average, and Region I, in this inquiry, yielded a percentage identical to that of the national percentage.

In Table 30 are provided the data in terms of willingness to participate in training and retraining programs and to become involved, as a volunteer, in more general community disaster preparedness activities.

With regard to participation in training programs, the percentages fall below the national average in Regions I, VII, V, IV and III. They are below the nation's average in Regions VIII, VII, II and V. But, of course, lest it be forgotten: the "lowest" percentage of expressed willingness to participate in emergency related training or retraining programs is 73.9 percent (!), an extremely high value in itself (Region VII), and similarly, the "lowest" expressed inclination to become involved in voluntary work connected with disaster preparedness programs is 70.7 percent (!) in Region VIII (where the propensity to participate in training programs is, at the same time, the highest one, and where the rating of the self-help concept is exceeded only by respondents from Region X, and but most marginally so).

Table 30

## Training and Volunteering Willingness

<u>Regions</u>	<u>P e r c e n t a g e s</u>	
	<u>Willingness Training</u>	<u>Volunteering</u>
Region I	75.0	78.4
Region II	81.1	72.4
Region III	80.1	79.9
Region IV	79.3	78.2
Region V	75.8	72.4
Region VI	87.3	83.9
Region VII	73.9	72.7
Region VIII	91.2	70.7
Region IX	86.4	82.1
Region X	82.5	78.9
<hr/>		
National average	80.3	77.0
<hr/>		

Region IX is, in terms of the data, of some special interest: the effectiveness indices, including possible effectiveness of self-help programs, are all below the nation's (high) averages. But the prior rate of volunteering and the expressed willingness to participate in training and in voluntary activities in disaster preparedness at the community level yield percentages above the national average. Thus even the relatively somewhat lower rating of the prospects of self-help still induces very high percentages of people willing to volunteer their services and somewhat even more so, to undergo training or retraining in disaster preparedness measures and programs.

Region V, too, is of some special interest: the effectiveness of both community and Federal programs is rated above the national average, but self-help, willingness to participate in training or in volunteering for community disaster programs is below the nation's average as is the actual claimed rate of previous year's volunteering. But, of course, given the high levels of all relevant indices, this still means that over 70 percent of the respondents expressed their preparedness to undergo training and also their inclination to volunteer for emergency management programs in their communities.

In Region I (New England states), the ratings of community and Federal governmental programs falls below the nation's average: but self-help rating, willingness to volunteer for community disaster preparedness programs, exceed the national means, and "last year's" volunteering rate lies just at the national average. There is, at the same time, somewhat less of an inclination to participate in training or retraining programs relevant to disaster preparedness.

If the Regions are ranked on their average ranking in evaluating effectiveness of community and Federal programs, and on their average ranking of their assessment of self-help, on



expressions of willingness to participate in training programs and in voluntary community disaster preparedness efforts, the correlation coefficient (Spearman Rho) is of the order of .39.

If the rankings on expressed willingness to be involved on a volunteer basis in community programs (whether training programs or more general volunteering or both) are related, across the Regions to reported previous year's volunteering rates, the correlation (Spearman Rho once again) is of the order of .44.

This means:

1. The better the community and Federal programs are evaluated, the higher the willingness to volunteer for disaster related activities. Thus there is an overriding tendency to view voluntary participation as a way to further strengthen community and Federal programs even though no government money (as the questions postulated to begin with) is involved to support, or sustain, such voluntary efforts.
2. The higher the participation in voluntary activities per se, the higher the inclination to also volunteer for local disaster preparedness programs. This suggests that "volunteers volunteer," not a surprising outcome, and in view of the percentages involved, it also indicates that the potential pool of volunteers for emergency management programs is quite vast as it includes not only those with prior volunteering experiences but also people who, at least in the course of the year prior to the study, did not claim to have done any voluntary work.

Meaningful interpretations of the possible variability among the respective states across the nation and within the administrative Regions are not really possible: there are simply too few cases to provide anything resembling reliable estimates once the data are disaggregated by the state (or Commonwealth) in which the respondents reside.

#### D. Highlights

1. There are no differences of significance in the items on which this report is focused (ratings of community and Federal program effectiveness, ratings of possible self-help activities, previous year's volunteering, willingness to volunteer for local emergency and disaster preparedness programs and willingness to participate in training or retraining programs) by the population size of the counties in which the respondents reside.
2. Only slightly so, community programs of disaster preparedness rate higher in the two "middle" categories of counties, those with 50,000 to 250,000 and 250,000 to 1,000,000 residents, than in the least and most populated ones.
3. Federal programs, in turn, get somewhat higher ratings as to their effectiveness in the two most populous counties.

4. And much like the effectiveness assessments of community disaster-related efforts, the idea of self-help programs is rated slightly higher in the two "middle" categories of counties than in either the most or least populated ones.
5. In the most and least populated counties, there are somewhat more volunteering claims - that is, the percentages of respondents who claim to have engaged in voluntary activities in the course of the previous year are somewhat higher than they are in the two "middle" size-tiers of counties.
6. The willingness to participate in training programs is, if again but modestly, higher in the two categories of counties with the largest populations (250,000 and above), while willingness to volunteer for disaster preparedness programs more generally is somewhat higher in the least populous counties (with a population of up to 50,000) than in the remaining categories of counties.
7. There is less of a difference among the ten administrative Regions in the evaluations of Federal programs than in the assessments of local activities. But as is invariably so, the rating indices for all Regions are lower for Federal than for community programs.
8. On both indices, Region X yields the highest values while Region I is characterized by the (relatively) lowest values attached to estimated effectiveness of both community and Federal programs.
9. The evaluations of the potential promise of self-help activities at the local level are, in terms of the regional distribution, quite homogeneous: but again, Region X ends up with the highest index value (with Regions VI and II with the next highest indices), while Region III data produce the lowest (relative) index value.
10. Regions X and VIII reported the highest percentages of prior year's voluntary efforts. The claims derived from data in Region IV are quite significantly lower than are the volunteering reports from the "high" Regions.
11. More than 9 out of 10 respondents in Region VIII declared their willingness to participate in training programs but only 7 out of ten (the lowest percentage across the Regions) were inclined to volunteer their time and effort for community disaster-related programs more generally.
12. In all, the indices (across all variables here considered) exceeds the national averages in Region X and all values, save for the percentage of those willing to volunteer for local disaster preparedness activities are above the nation's "norm" in Regions II and VIII as well.
13. By contrast, in Region VII, the only values above the national average are associated with the effectiveness rating of community programs and with reported voluntary involvements in the course of the previous year, while in Region V both Federal and local programs are rated as of somewhat higher-than-average effectiveness, but all remaining indices lie below the national average. This means, overall, that in Regions VII and V there is somewhat less

than average appreciation of the possibilities of self-help, less than average propensity to participate in training, and less than average tendency to claim willingness to volunteer for disaster-related programs.

Yet, even at the risk of heavy repetitiousness, it cannot be sufficiently emphasized that all the indices are consistently of similar orders of magnitude; and all are quite high (save for the rating of Federal programs which yields indices slightly below the midpoint of 50). So that findings indicating an "higher" or "lower" values in these types of comparisons must be understood, and interpreted, in the context of these rather homogeneous and decidedly high values.

## VIII. SOME POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This study has explored three key dimensions of voluntary action as it bears on disasters and emergencies. For one, the extent to which people are inclined to consider the idea of community self-help a worthwhile one. Second, whether they might be willing to undergo training (of otherwise unspecified nature) to enhance their knowledge and skills to deal with emergency situations. Third, whether they would be likely to invest their time and effort in voluntary activities in their community's emergency management programs.

Some implications of the findings seem altogether clear.

A policy to place considerable reliance on volunteers, beyond those that might be currently involved, stands a very good chance of being quite successful.

This holds whether or not the Federal Government would provide financial or technical assistance to municipalities and other relevant jurisdictions (such as counties). In other words, the decision to seek and use volunteers at the local level would prove altogether effective regardless of the role the Federal Government might play. This conclusion is strongly supported by the invariably high ratings of the "self-help" concept since, in this item, it was made clear to the respondents that the idea is predicated on non-involvement of Government.

Yet, the possible emergence of self-help groups in any community would need to be somehow triggered. There is no evidence to indicate that such activities would occur spontaneously though they may well mushroom and persist in a spontaneous mode once begun. Thus some minimum involvement of Government, at least in so far as local emergency management officials are concerned, is a prerequisite should efforts be made to generate some self-help groups. At a minimum, the impetus toward such organizing would have to come from such officials (at whatever level of Government) and clearly, some technical assistance would prove necessary, at least in the way of advice as to what kinds of activities might such self-help groups engage in. Needless to say, further guidance of any such groups would also be required if only to assure that their activities do not conflict, or compete, with official emergency management programs.

Now there exists clearly a massive reservoir of people expressing their willingness to be trained as well as their willingness to serve as volunteers. Even if but a rather small fraction of these intentions were actualized, any program would stand to face problems of abundance of volunteers rather than problems of scarcity.

Just about as many people who reported some previous training as those without such prior training said that they would be willing to participate in training programs. It is not clear from the data, whether those with prior training (for instance of the first aid variety) meant that they would want to update and upgrade their knowledge and skills along the lines of the former training, or whether they would (perhaps) prefer to learn some other, new skills.

But all this has important implications for the design of training programs: one would need a different approach and program level for those who seek to enhance knowledge and skills they

already have from a more elementary approach to train those who are, so to say, novices. And to do so, it would be quite essential (at the appropriate jurisdictional level at which such training options might be considered and adopted) to first determine the distribution of potential trainees along these lines: that is, how many are likely to want to upgrade their prior training and how many would be "beginners."

Even if nation-wide data in this regard were available, and they are not in any case, they would not be sufficiently focused to provide anything resembling quantitative guidance at the more local levels of governance. In any event, the strategic issues in the design of training programs revolve around the decisions what it is that people need to and desire to be trained in and for. And these decisions, save for the possible generic need of some skills and insights related to war preparedness measures, cannot but be affected by the specific types of risks which a community has experienced or might be exposed to in the future. The preparation of relevant training materials, and even the training of "trainers," of course, can be accomplished in a more standardized manner and might, to that extent, levy requirements on the Federal Government, the Federal Emergency Management Agency more specifically, should states, counties or localities seek to develop and implement training activities for citizens inclined to avail themselves of such opportunities. Yet, even in this respect the involvement of the Federal Government may not prove a precondition: it is easily imaginable that organizations such as the American Red Cross could, and would, be in a position to expand their already rich activities and develop training packages and train trainers should a significant nation-wide effort be undertaken.

If the data indicate that there would be no difficulties in enticing volunteering on the part of the public, there are, indeed, some highly applicable cautions. For one, the high expressions of willingness to volunteers were obtained in the course of direct, in this instance, telephone, contacts with each respondent. Thus any effort to recruit volunteers, if one were to be made, would "map" onto the kind of data the study reveals only to the extent to which a personalized approach were used. A more impersonal way of recruiting, for instance via newspapers, radio or television, or even by mail, cannot be assumed to produce similar results - and what the results of such recruitment strategies might be cannot be ascertained. Chances are, however, that the public response would be dramatically less positive than it would be in the more personal mode of seeking voluntary participation.

Second, it needs to be noted that it would prove much easier to recruit volunteers than to keep them involved. Furthermore, volunteers who "drop out" because their expectations were not met are much less prone to be recruited again. Thus much, in this regard, depends on the perceived worthwhileness of the activities for which volunteers are sought, and on the need for such activities to be repeatedly, if not continuously, required. This is so unless it is made clear at the very outset, and as an aspect of recruitment, that the involvement is related to some essentially "one-shot" or only "brief duration" need.

Third, a generalized willingness to volunteer does not mean actual volunteering when it comes to a specific type of activity. In other words, for any given program, the pool of potential volunteers would prove to be substantially smaller than the generic findings indicate - if only because any specific program would have to be set up on particular days and at particular hours and, apart from possible lack of interest in that specific volunteering opportunity - though

remaining a potential volunteer for other activities, not everyone willing to participate is likely to be actually available on specified days and at specified times.

Now it would be most worthwhile if an inventory were generated of the kinds of activities that would be most suitable for volunteers to undertake, and to identify the kinds of knowledge and skills required in the performance of such voluntary work. This, of course, would also help define some training program requirements. Above all, however, it would help in determining the best use of potential volunteers and, in turn, in defining more precisely, and at the appropriate jurisdictional level, the actual pool of likely volunteers.

Yet another aspect of the information puzzle merits attention: many people prefer to volunteer for the kinds of activities for which their knowledge and skill already have equipped them, or for activities that are closely related to their existing patterns of know-how; other people, however, prefer to volunteer for activities that are quite new to them and seek to learn, in the course of volunteering, something different and new. The distribution of potential volunteers along these lines, of course, has considerable significance in the way specific volunteers are recruited and, indeed, "assigned" to various tasks.

In all, however, whatever qualifications and limitations might be suggested, there is no doubt whatsoever that programs of self-help at the community level, of training people to better cope with disasters and emergencies on their own and in helping their fellow citizens, of involving volunteers in disaster and emergency preparedness programs find solid and strong support in the nation's body politic. Thus policies, if adopted and implemented, to tap the vast manpower resource throughout the nation are almost certain to prove effective.

Revised 4/25/89

DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS

(Unclassified Reports/Unlimited Distribution)

Defense Technical Information Center  
Cameron Station  
Alexandria, VA 22314 12 copies

Federal Emergency Management Agency  
ATTN: Librarian  
Washington, DC 20472 2 copies

National Emergency Training Center  
Federal Emergency Management Agency  
ATTN: Learning Resource Center  
Washington, DC 20472 1 copy

Federal Emergency Management Agency  
ATTN: Dr. Ralph Swisher  
SL-DC-MP  
Washington, DC 20472 40 copies

Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
ATTN: Librarian  
P. O. Box X  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory  
ATTN: Document Library  
Los Alamos, NM 87544

The Rand Corporation  
ATTN: Document Library  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90401

University Center for Social  
and Urban Research  
Risk Analysis & Emergency  
Management Program  
16th Floor Cathedral of Learning  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Required Foreign

Secretaire d'Administration  
Ministere de l'Interieur  
Direction Generale de la Protection Civile  
rue de Louvain, 1  
1000 Brussels  
BELGIUM

Canadian Defence Research Staff  
ATTN: Mr. J. Ray Brown  
2450 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20008

Director  
Civilforsvarsstyrelsen  
Stockholmsgade 27  
2100 Copenhagen 0  
DENMARK

Direction de la Securite Civile  
Ministere de l'Interieur  
18 Rue Ernest Cognac  
92 Levallois  
Paris, FRANCE

Bundesministerium des Innern  
Graurheindorfer Strasse 198  
5300 Bonn 1  
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Ministry of Social Services  
11 Spartis Street  
Athens  
GREECE

Almannavarnir Rikisins  
Reykjavic  
ICELAND

Stato Maggiore Difesa Civile  
Centro Studi Difesa Civile  
Rome  
ITALY

Directeur de la Protection Civile  
Ministere de l'Interieur  
36 Rue J. B. Esch  
Grande-Duche de LUXEMBOURG



Directeur Organisatie  
Bescherming Bevolking  
Ministry of Interior  
Schedeldoekshaven 200  
Postbus 20011  
2500 The Hague  
THE NETHERLANDS

The Head of Sivilforsvaret  
Sandakerveien 12  
Postboks 8136  
Oslo dep  
Oslo 1  
NORWAY

Servicio Nacional de Proteccao Civil  
Rua Bela Vista a Lapa, 57  
1200 Lisbon  
PORTUGAL

Jefe, Seccion de Estudios y Planificacion  
c/Evaristo San Miguel, 8  
Madrid-8  
ESPANA

Civil Defense Administration  
Ministry of Interior  
Ankara  
TURKEY

Home Office  
Scientific Advisory Branch  
Horseferry House  
Dean Ryle Street  
London SW1P 2AW  
ENGLAND

Mr. Eric E. Alley, Esquire  
President  
The Institute of Civil Defence  
Bell Court House  
Blomfield Street  
London EC2M 7AY  
ENGLAND

Civil Emergency Planning Directorate  
North Atlantic Treaty Organization  
1110 NATO  
BELGIUM

Claude de Ville de Goyet, M.D.  
Chief, Program of Emergency Preparedness  
and Disaster Relief Coordination  
Pan-American Health Organization  
525 Twenty-Third Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037

ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION

The American Civil Defense  
Association (TACDA)  
P.O. Box 1057  
Starke, FL 32091

Dr. William Anderson  
Division of Fundamental Research for  
Emerging and Critical Engineering Systems  
National Science Foundation  
1800 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20550

Bobby Baines  
Office of Disaster Services  
American National Red Cross  
17th and D Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Thomas Baldwin, Ph.D.  
277 Main Street - 2nd Floor  
Port Washington, NY 11050

Jerome I. Barancik, Sc.D.  
Injury Prevention and Analysis Group  
Bldg 475  
Brookhaven National Laboratory  
Upton, NY 11973  
(516) 282-2016

Harvey M. Bernstein, V. Pres.  
Applied Management Science  
962 Wayne Avenue, Suite 701  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

John Billheimer  
SYSTAN, Inc.  
P. O. Box U  
343 Second Street  
Los Altos, CA 94022

Janet K. Bradford, Chief  
Program Development & Research  
California Specialized Training Institute  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Michael Brady  
Program Development & Research  
California Specialized Training Institute  
P.O. Box 8104  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403-8104

Allan Braslow, Ph.D.  
Health & Safety Division  
American National Red Cross  
1730 E. Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Reginald Brown  
Center for Strategic & Int'l Studies  
1800 K Street, N.W. - Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20006

Dr. James O. Buchanan  
Associate Staff Scientist  
National Council on Radiation  
Protection and Measurements  
7910 Woodmont Avenue - Suite 1016  
Bethesda, Md 20814-3095

Dr. Theodore Caplow  
United Research Services  
P. O. Box 20  
Charlottesville, VA 22902-0020

Robert L. Chartrand  
Senior Specialist in Information  
Policy and Technology  
Congressional Research Services  
Library of Congress  
Washington, DC 20540

Dr. William W. Chenault  
HRS  
7710 Old Springhouse Road  
McLean, VA 22101

Dr. Conrad V. Chester  
Emergency Planning Group  
Energy Division  
ORNL  
P.O. Box X  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Dr. John Christiansen  
Department of Sociology  
834 SWKT  
Brigham Young University  
Provo, UT 84602

John D. Christie, Ph.D.  
Vice President  
Van Es Associates  
One Skyline Place - Suite 1407  
5205 Leesburg Pike  
Falls Church, VA 22041  
(703) 931-7500 (Res: 703-525-0590  
Baltimore (301) 792-7370

Robert J. Coullahan  
Information Systems Group T-8-3  
Science Applications International Corp.  
1710 Goodridge Drive  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 749-5974

Francis T. Crimmins, Director  
Chemical Warfare/Chemical & Biological  
Defense Information Analysis Center  
Battelle Edgewood Operations  
2113 Emmerton Park Road  
Edgewood, MD 21040

Mr. Drew Dawson  
National Association of State  
Emergency Medical Service Directors  
Emergency Medical Service Bureau  
Cogswell Building  
Helena, MT 59620

Craig DeAtley, PA-C  
Associate Professor  
Director, Emergency Medical  
Services Degree Program  
George Washington University  
Medical Center  
2140 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel. 202-994-4372

Professor Thomas Drabek, Chairman  
Department of Sociology  
Denver University  
Denver, CO 80208

Donald Dressler, M.D.  
300 Mt. Auburn Street  
Cambridge, MA 02238

-or-

Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery  
Harvard Medical School  
Boston, MA

Earthquake Engineering Research Institute  
ATTN: Dr. Robert E. Scholl  
2620 Telegraph Avenue  
Berkeley, CA 94704

Earthquake Engineering Research Institute  
ATTN: Dr. Robert E. Scholl  
2620 Telegraph Avenue  
Berkeley, CA 94704

Prof. Robert Ehrlich  
Chairman, Physics Department  
George Mason University  
4400 University Drive  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
(Tel. 323-2303)

George J. Giangli  
Corporate Manager  
Emergency Preparedness  
GPU Nuclear Corporation  
2574 Interstate Drive  
Harrisburg, PA 17110  
(Tel. 717-948-8440)

Charles Glass  
Office of Enforcement and Emergency  
Services  
National Highway Traffic Safety  
Administration, DOT  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20590

Ivars Gutmanis, President  
Sterling-Hobe Corp.  
910 Seventeenth Street, N.W. - Suite 309  
Washington, DC 20006

Edward L. Hill, Director  
Operations Analysis Division  
Research Triangle Institute  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Ms. Ellen Hume  
EMS Clearinghouse  
c/o The Council of State Governments  
Iron Works Pike  
P.O. Box 11910  
Lexington, KY 40578

Patricia Hutar, Director  
Office of International Medicine  
American Medical Association  
535 North Dearborn Street  
Chicago, IL 60610

Prof. Brandon Johnson  
STS Program  
Michigan Technological University  
Houghton, MI 49931

Nolan Jones, Ph.D.  
National Governors Association  
444 North Capitol Street  
Washington, DC 20001

Mr. Larry S. Jordan  
Administrator  
Emergency Medical Services  
Department of Health & Rehabilitation  
1317 Winewood Boulevard, PDHEMS  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Professor Jack Kartez  
Center for Urban Studies  
Hickerson House  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Roger Kasperson, Director  
The Center for Technology,  
Environment & Development  
Clark University  
950 Main Street  
Worcester, MA 01610

Joseph H. Keller  
Fellow Scientist, Special Programs  
Westinghouse Idaho Nuclear Co., Inc.  
Idaho National Engineering Laboratory  
P.O. Box 4000  
Idaho Falls, ID 83403

Jack Kolb  
906 Annmore Drive  
Silver Spring, MD 20902

Professor Gary Kreps, Chairman  
Department of Sociology  
College of William and Mary  
Williamsburg, VA 23185

Professor Robert Leik  
Department of Sociology  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Joseph Lischka  
BDM Corporation  
3005 Center Green Drive  
Boulder, CO 80301

Jack Long  
Schneider Engineers  
EC Planning & Management Services  
2101 North Front Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17110

Dr. Mary Lystad, Chief  
Center for Mental Health  
Studies of Emergencies  
Rm 6 C-12 Parklawn Building  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, MD 20856

Professor Peter May  
Graduate School of Public Affairs  
University of Washington  
DP 30  
Seattle, WA 98105

Professor Dennis Miletic  
Department of Sociology  
Colorado State University  
Ft. Collins, CO 80523

Lt. Col. Earnest A. Miller, Director  
National Public Affairs Office  
Salvation Army  
1025 Vermont Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

Ms. Rose Mary Mims  
Systems Research and  
Applications Corporation  
2425 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22201

Professor Joseph Minor  
Institute of Disaster Research  
Department of Engineering  
Texas Technical University  
Box 4089  
Lubbock, TX 79409

Professor Kenneth Mitchell  
Department of Geography  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

Dr. James W. Morentz, President  
Research Alternatives  
966 Hungerford Drive - Suite 31  
Rockville, MD 20850

Prof. Jiri Nehnevajsa  
Department of Sociology  
2L22 Forbes Quadrangle  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Prof. Joanne M. Nigg, Director  
Office of Hazards Studies  
Wilson Hall, Room 130  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, AZ 85287

Jane M. Orient, M.D.  
Doctors for Disaster Preparedness  
118 Court Street  
Post Office Box 1057  
Starke, Florida 32091

Col. James Osborne  
Emergency Coordinator  
Salvation Army  
799 Bloomfield Avenue  
Verona, NJ 07044

Elder Perry F. Pedersen, Director  
Community and Disaster Services  
Seventh Day Adventist Church  
6840 Eastern Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20012

Prof. Ron Perry  
Center for Public Affairs  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, AZ 85287

Prof. Enrico Quarantelli, Director  
Disaster Research Center  
Department of Sociology  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19716



Prof. Sridhar J.K. Rao  
Department of Civil Engineering  
California State University  
1250 Bellflower Boulevard  
Long Beach, CA 90840

Stephen Rayner, Ph.D.  
Energy Division  
ORNL  
P.O. Box X  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Dr. William Riebsame, Director  
Natural Hazards Research and  
Applications Information Center  
University of Colorado  
IBS #6, Box 492  
Boulder, CO 80309

George O. Rogers, Ph.D.  
John Sorenson  
Integrated Assessment  
Energy Division  
ORNL  
P.O. Box 2001  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Professor Peter Rossi, Director  
Social & Demographic Research Institute  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01003

Claire Rubin, Director  
Natural Disaster Research Center  
Program of Policy Studies in  
Science and Technology  
George Washington University  
Washington, DC 20052

Joseph Russo  
8613 Melwood Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817

Joachim E. Scholz, Pres.  
Orion Research, Inc.  
1811 Abbey Oak Drive  
Vienna, VA 22180  
(703) 938-3482

Ms. Pam Snyder  
UCSUR  
16th Floor Cathedral of Learning  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. John Sorensen  
Energy Division  
ORNL  
P.O. Box X  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

SRI International  
333 Ravenswood Avenue  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Walmer E. Strobe  
Center for Planning and Research  
5600 Columbia Pike, Suite 101  
Bailey's Crossroads, VA 22041

M.J. Taubenslag  
TASCQ Services, Inc.  
3103 Jeffrey Road  
Baltimore, MD 21207

Prof. Marc Trachtenberg  
Department of History  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104  
Tel. (215) 898-8477

Prof. Ralph Turner  
Department of Sociology  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Daniel Weiss, M.D.  
7201 Park Terrace Drive  
Alexandria, VA 22307

Prof. Dennis Wenger  
Hazard Reduction & Recovery Center  
College of Architecture  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77843-3137

Robert Wilkerson, Pres.  
The Corporate Response Group, Inc.  
1818 N Street, N.W. - Suite 325  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 775-0177

Martha Williams, Ph.D.  
Coordinated Science Laboratory  
1101 Springfield Avenue  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Charles Wittenberg, Pres.  
WCA, Inc.  
127 State Street  
Kirkland, WA 98033

Prof. Sherman Wyman  
Institute of Urban Studies  
University of Texas  
Arlington, TX 76019

Federal Emergency Coordinators

Craig Alderman, Jr.  
Director, Emergency Planning  
Office of the Secretary of Defense  
Department of Defense  
Washington, DC 20310-2200

Deputy Assistant Secretary  
for Energy Emergencies  
Department of Energy  
Room 7C-016  
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20585

H. Earl Belue  
Health Resources & Services Admin.  
DHHS/PHS  
Rm 17A-55 Parklawn Building  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, MD 20857

Goldie L. Brody  
Emergency Coordinator  
Management Coordination and  
Programs Staff  
Social Security Administration, DHHS  
6401 Security Boulevard  
Baltimore, MD 21235

Milton L. Brooks  
Emergency Coordinator  
Urban Mass Transit Administration, DOT  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20590

Barbara Brown  
Enforcement, Emergency Preparedness  
and Security Management  
U.S. Department of Interior  
18th & C Street, N.W. - Rm 5426  
Washington, DC 20240

James L. Campbell  
Emergency Warning Meteorologist  
Severe Weather Branch  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric  
Administration, DOC  
6010 Executive Avenue  
Rockville, MD 10852

Bruce Chelikowsky  
Indian Health Service  
HRSA/PHS  
5600 Fishers Lane - Rm 6A08  
Rockville, MD 20857

John W. Christensen  
Disaster Coordinator  
Department of Education  
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20202

Charles R. Clauson  
Civil Defense Coordinator  
U.S. Postal Service  
475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20260-2185

Steve Coffman  
Operations Center  
Department of State  
Washington, DC 20520

Barbara Conway  
Emergency Coordinator  
Office of Human Development  
Services/DHHS  
200 Independence Ave., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20201

CAPT. Michael Cowan, M.D., USN  
Office of the Assistant Secretary  
of Defense (Health Affairs)  
ODASD Medical Readiness  
The Pentagon - 3E269  
Washington, D.C. 20301-1200

Oliver Davidson  
U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (AID)  
Rm. 1262A, NS  
Department of State  
Washington, DC 20520

Drew B. Farenwald  
Chief, Technical Integration Division  
U.S. Army Chemical Research, Development  
& Engineering Center (CRDEC)  
Aberdeen Proving Grounds, MD 21010-5423  
(Tel. 301-671-3048)

Robert Foss, Jr.  
Emergency Coordinator  
Department of the Treasury  
Main Treasury Bldg. - Rm 1308  
15th & Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20220

Joseph Fulnecky, Chief  
Hazardous Materials Branch  
Federal Highway Administration, DOT  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Bernard A. Gattozzi, Chief  
Emergency Programs Staff  
Justice Management Division  
Department of Justice  
10th & Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530

Gordon R. Giersch  
Emergency Coordinator  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Department of Energy  
825 No. Capitol St., N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

William Gillen  
Emergency Preparedness Manager  
DHHS  
3B 10 Hubert Humphrey Bldg.  
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20201

Kent Gray  
CDC ERCC  
1600 Clifton Road, N.E. - MAIL STOP F38  
Atlanta, GA 30333

Michael Hartley  
CDR USACE [LAEN-CWO-W]  
Washington, DC 20314-1000

Buster Horton  
Emergency Programs  
Office of Personnel  
US Dept. of Agriculture  
Room S 302S South Building  
Washington, DC 20250

Ed L. Jordan, Director  
Division of Emergency Preparedness  
Engineering Response  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

Bernard Kulik  
Deputy Associate Administrator  
for Disaster Assistance  
Small Business Administration  
1441 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20416

Alex R. Lawrence  
Emergency Coordinator  
National Highway Traffic  
Safety Administration  
Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Strteet, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20590  
Joseph Lischka  
BDM Corporation  
3005 Center Green Drive  
Boulder, CO 80301

Joe Logsdon  
Emergency Coordinator  
Surveillance and Preparedness Div.  
Office of Radiation Programs  
Environmental Protection Agency  
401 M Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20460

LTC James H. Lyles  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
HQUSACE [DAEN-CWO]  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20314-1000  
James Makris  
Office of Solid Waste & Emergency Response  
Environmental Protection Agency  
WH 562A  
401 M Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20460

Leonard P. Mandrgoc  
USDA Emergency Coordinator  
Office of Personnel  
14th and Independence Ave., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20250

William McLoughlin, Coordinator  
Office of Emergency Preparedness Planning  
Employment Standards Administration  
Department of Labor  
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20210

Lloyd E. Milburn  
Director, Office of Emergency  
Transportation  
Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20590

Robert B. Minogue  
Office of NRC Research  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commn.  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Terrence F. Monihan, Director  
Emergency Preparedness Staff  
Office of Administrative Services  
Dept. of Housing & Urban Development  
451 Seventh St., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20410

Chet Pauls  
Office of Drinking Water  
Environmental Protection Agency  
East Tower - Rm 1005  
401 M Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20460

Bruce Pelton  
Emergency Coordinator  
U.S. Department of Commerce  
Office of the Secretary  
Room 5044 HCHB  
Washington, DC 20230

Judy Poston  
Emergency Coordinator  
Office of Family Assistance  
Social Security Administration, DHHS  
6401 Security Boulevard  
Baltimore, MD 21235

Mr. James P. Power  
Emergency Coordinator  
National Headquarters  
Selective Service System  
Washington, DC 20435

Thomas P. Reutershan  
Emergency Coordinator  
U.S. Public Health Service  
5600 Fishers Lane - Rm 4-81  
Rockville, MD 20857

Lawrence B. Hobson, M.D.  
Director, Emergency Management  
& Resource Sharing Service  
Veterans Administration  
810 Vermont Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20420

Robert J. Shea, Manager  
Emergency Management Programs  
Federal Railroad Administration  
Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh St., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20590

Robert Sheets, Director  
National Hurricane Center, NOAA  
Room 631, Gables One Tower  
1320 South Dixie Highway  
Coral Gables, FL 22146

Jack Stanton, Director  
Emergency Response Division  
Office of Emergency and  
Remedial Response  
Environmental Protection Agency  
401 M Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20460

Ralph Stork  
Emergency Coordinator  
National Institutes of Health  
Bldg 13, Rm 2E-57  
9000 Rockville Pike  
Bethesda, MD 20205

Fred Talcott  
PM-220  
Environmental Protection Agency  
401 M Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20460



Richard Torbick, Chief  
Program Management Division  
Federal Highway Administration  
Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh St., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20590

Sylvia Vela  
Emergency Coordinator  
Office of Human Development  
Services. DHHS  
200 Independence Ave., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20201

Richard E. Weiner, Director  
Office of Energy Emergency  
Operations  
Department of Energy  
Forrestal Building  
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20585

Kenneth Welty  
FHWA/DOT  
HPM-30 (Rm 3306)  
400 7th St., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20550

Overseas

Prof. Dr. Lars Clausen  
Soziologisches Seminar der  
Christian-Albrechts-Universitat  
Olshausenstrasse 40/60  
D-2300 Kiel  
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mrs. F. Lorraine Davies  
Director, Emergency Services  
Medical Services Branch  
Health and Welfare Canada  
11th Floor Jeanne Mance Building  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0L3  
CANADA

Mr. Richard Gibson  
Contingency Services Training Officer  
Emergency Health Services  
Ontario Ministry of Health  
7 Overlea Boulevard - 7th Floor  
Toronto, Ontario M4H 1A8  
CANADA

Mr. Colin Green  
Middlesex Polytechnic  
Queensway, Enfield EN3 4SF  
ENGLAND

Dr. Leif Hedberg  
National Defence Research Institute  
Defence Analysis Department  
P.O. Box 27322  
S-102 54 STOCKHOLM, Sweden

Ross Lunn  
Office of International Affairs  
Emergency Planning Canada  
Gillin Building  
141 Laurier Avenue, West  
Ottawa K1A0W6  
Ontario, CANADA

Carlo Pelanda  
Istituto di Sociologia Internazionale  
I34170 Gorizia - Via Malta, 2  
Italia  
Tel. (0481) 83632

Dr. Thomas Ritchey  
National Defence Research Institute  
Defence Analysis Department  
P.O. Box 27322  
S-102 54 STOCKHOLM, Sweden

Lloyd Swick  
Principal Consultant for  
Public Protection  
Emergency Planning Canada  
Gillin Building  
141 Laurier Avenue, West  
Ottawa K1A0W6  
Ontario, CANADA

Ms. Sarah Paul  
Fire and Emergency Services  
Department - F6 Division  
Home Office  
Queen Anne's Gate  
London, SW1H 9AT  
ENGLAND

Charles Vlek  
Institute for Experimental Psychology  
University of Groningen  
P.O. Box 14  
9750 AA Haren  
THE NETHERLANDS

NATIONAL RESPONSE TEAM

Mr. Bruce Blanchard  
Director  
Office of Environmental Project Review  
Department of the Interior  
Main Interior Building  
Washington, DC 20240

Mr. Sherwood Chu  
Associate Director  
Office of Regulations Planning & Analysis  
Research & Special Programs Administration  
Department of Transportation  
Room 8432  
Washington, DC 20590

Mr. Peter J. Cifala  
Emergency Preparedness Officer  
Food & Drug Administration  
Department of Health and Human Services  
Room 1362  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, MD 20857

Mr. Mark Fitzswimmons  
Environmental Defense Section  
Land & Natural Resources Division  
Department of Justice  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Room 4440  
Washington, DC 20026-3986

Dr. Michael Heeb  
Office of Assistant Secretary  
of Defense (MRA&L)  
Department of Defense  
Room 3D833, Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301

Ms. Georgi Jones  
Chief, Agency for Toxic  
Substance & Disease Registry Group  
Department of Health and Human Services  
Hubert Humphrey Building  
200 Independence Ave., SW  
Room 714B  
Washington, DC 20201

Ms. Sheila Jones  
Chief  
Environmental Enforcement Section  
Department of Justice  
10th & Constitution Ave., NW  
Room 1243  
Washington, DC 20530

Mr. George Kinter  
Super Fund Program Manager  
Office of Oceanography & Marine  
Assessment  
National Oceanic & Atmospheric  
Administration  
Department of Commerce  
11400 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852

Mr. Dennis Kwiatkowski  
Assistant Associate Director  
Office of Natural & Technological Hazards  
FEMA  
500 C Street, S.W. - Rm 630  
Washington, D.C. 20472

Mr. Bill Opfer  
Environmental Health Engineer  
Department of Agriculture  
Forest Service  
PO Box 2417  
Washington, DC 20013

Mr. Kenneth E. Perkins  
Chief, Incident Response Branch  
Office of Analysis & Evaluation  
of Operational Data  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Alan Roberts  
Associate Director  
Office of Hazardous Materials Transportation  
Research & Special Programs Administration  
Department of Transportation  
Nassif Building - Room 8100  
400 - 7th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20590

Mr. Tucker Scully  
Director  
OES/OPA, Room 5801  
Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520

Mr. Lawrence M. Sparks  
Division of Environmental  
Guidance (EH-231)  
Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave., SW  
Washington, D.C. 20545

Captain Robert L. Storch, Jr.  
Assistant Chief  
Environmental Response Division  
U.S. Coast Guard  
2100 2nd Street, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20593

Mr. George G. Turner  
EPA/CG Liason  
U.S. Coast Guard  
2100 Second St., N.W. - Rm 1205  
Washington, D.C. 20593

FEDERAL INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON EMS - MEMBERSHIP LIST Feb. 10, 1989

Mr. John D. Reardon  
Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness  
Health Resources and Services Administration  
U.S. Public Health Service  
U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services  
5600 Fishers Lane, ROOM # 13A22  
Rockville, MD 20857

Commander B. Thomas Scheib  
National Highway Traffic Safety  
Administration/NTS-42  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 7th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Mr. Charles J. Glass  
Highway Safety Management Specialist  
National Highway Traffic  
Safety Administration  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 7th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Mr. Roger Reinke  
National Telecommunications  
and Information Administration  
Department of Commerce  
14th & Constitution Ave. N.W. Rm H4706  
Washington, D.C. 20230

Mr. William Clark  
Office of Public Health Service Emergency  
Coordinator  
U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, MD 20857

William Brogan, Safety Engineer  
Office of Fire Prevention and System Safety  
U.S.DOL - OSHA  
R, M3609 Fpb  
200 Constitution Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20210

Jerome I. Barancik, Sc.D.  
Injury Prevention and Analysis Group  
Bldg 475  
Brookhaven National Laboratory  
Upton, NY 11973

Ms. Mary Berkeley  
Director  
Emergency Medical Services  
1660 L Street, NW - Room 1223  
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Richard Bissell  
Medical Care Development International  
1742 R Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20009

Brad Cushing, M.D.  
Program Manager  
The Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.  
National Study Center for Trauma  
and Emergency Medical Systems  
22 South Greene Street  
Baltimore, MD 21201

Alan R. Dimick, M.D.  
Chairman, AMA Commission on EMS  
Department of Surgery  
University of Alabama at Birmingham  
Birmingham, AL 35294

Eric Noji, M.D.  
Department of Emergency Medicine  
John Hopkins Hospital  
600 Wolfe Street  
Baltimore, MD 21205

Barak Wolff, Chief  
Primary Care and EMS Bureau  
Helath Services Division  
Health & Environmental Department  
P.O. Box 968  
Santa Fe, NM 87504-0968

**Volunteering for Emergency Preparedness**  
Unclassified, University of Pittsburgh, May, 1989, 69 pp.  
FEMA Cooperative Agreement: EMW-K-1024, Work Unit 4851B  
Abstract

This nationwide quantitative telephone survey predicts levels of voluntary activity for emergency and disaster preparedness. The study involved a random national phone sample of 1,595 respondents in the 48 contiguous states.

Actual voluntary activity performed during or immediately following an emergency or disaster is not explicitly considered in the research. Rather, this study attempts to measure willingness to volunteer and willingness to participate in training programs. Training programs are conceptualized to mean both education and practice. The study also includes rating schedules—poor to excellent—for attitudes toward the "self-help" concept and perceived effectiveness of local and Federal government emergency and disaster programs.

While the self-help concept rating is considered as a variable in its own right, evaluation consists of its relation to the following variables: prior volunteer experience, the expressed willingness to volunteer, and the perceived effectiveness of each local and Federal government programs. Indices are computed for the perceived effectiveness of government programs, and compared with percentages that reflect respondents ratings of the self-help concept, as well as prior and expressed willingness for volunteering and training activities. Patterns of participation in training and volunteering are also examined.

(continued on back of card)

**Volunteering for Emergency Preparedness**  
Unclassified, University of Pittsburgh, May, 1989, 69 pp.  
FEMA Cooperative Agreement: EMW-K-1024, Work Unit 4851B  
Abstract

This nationwide quantitative telephone survey predicts levels of voluntary activity for emergency and disaster preparedness. The study involved a random national phone sample of 1,595 respondents in the 48 contiguous states.

Actual voluntary activity performed during or immediately following an emergency or disaster is not explicitly considered in the research. Rather, this study attempts to measure willingness to volunteer and willingness to participate in training programs. Training programs are conceptualized to mean both education and practice. The study also includes rating schedules—poor to excellent—for attitudes toward the "self-help" concept and perceived effectiveness of local and Federal government emergency and disaster programs.

While the self-help concept rating is considered as a variable in its own right, evaluation consists of its relation to the following variables: prior volunteer experience, the expressed willingness to volunteer, and the perceived effectiveness of each local and Federal government programs. Indices are computed for the perceived effectiveness of government programs, and compared with percentages that reflect respondents ratings of the self-help concept, as well as prior and expressed willingness for volunteering and training activities. Patterns of participation in training and volunteering are also examined.

(continued on back of card)

**Volunteering for Emergency Preparedness**  
Unclassified, University of Pittsburgh, May, 1989, 69 pp.  
FEMA Cooperative Agreement: EMW-K-1024, Work Unit 4851B  
Abstract

This nationwide quantitative telephone survey predicts levels of voluntary activity for emergency and disaster preparedness. The study involved a random national phone sample of 1,595 respondents in the 48 contiguous states.

Actual voluntary activity performed during or immediately following an emergency or disaster is not explicitly considered in the research. Rather, this study attempts to measure willingness to volunteer and willingness to participate in training programs. Training programs are conceptualized to mean both education and practice. The study also includes rating schedules—poor to excellent—for attitudes toward the "self-help" concept and perceived effectiveness of local and Federal government emergency and disaster programs.

While the self-help concept rating is considered as a variable in its own right, evaluation consists of its relation to the following variables: prior volunteer experience, the expressed willingness to volunteer, and the perceived effectiveness of each local and Federal government programs. Indices are computed for the perceived effectiveness of government programs, and compared with percentages that reflect respondents ratings of the self-help concept, as well as prior and expressed willingness for volunteering and training activities. Patterns of participation in training and volunteering are also examined.

(continued on back of card)

**Volunteering for Emergency Preparedness**  
Unclassified, University of Pittsburgh, May, 1989, 69 pp.  
FEMA Cooperative Agreement: EMW-K-1024, Work Unit 4851B  
Abstract

This nationwide quantitative telephone survey predicts levels of voluntary activity for emergency and disaster preparedness. The study involved a random national phone sample of 1,595 respondents in the 48 contiguous states.

Actual voluntary activity performed during or immediately following an emergency or disaster is not explicitly considered in the research. Rather, this study attempts to measure willingness to volunteer and willingness to participate in training programs. Training programs are conceptualized to mean both education and practice. The study also includes rating schedules—poor to excellent—for attitudes toward the "self-help" concept and perceived effectiveness of local and Federal government emergency and disaster programs.

While the self-help concept rating is considered as a variable in its own right, evaluation consists of its relation to the following variables: prior volunteer experience, the expressed willingness to volunteer, and the perceived effectiveness of each local and Federal government programs. Indices are computed for the perceived effectiveness of government programs, and compared with percentages that reflect respondents ratings of the self-help concept, as well as prior and expressed willingness for volunteering and training activities. Patterns of participation in training and volunteering are also examined.

(continued on back of card)



Overall findings indicate a national consensus toward willingness to participate in both training and volunteering activities. The self-help concept is rated, consistently overall, as a "very good" idea. The perceived effectiveness of local programs rated higher than that of Federal programs, across all comparisons.

Data are also analyzed in terms of geographic areas: counties and administrative regions. Demographics and selected background traits are also compared to responses. No significant relationships are found when claims to voluntary activity are compared to geographic areas and demographics.

It is suggested that public policy in this field be directed toward managing a large pool of volunteers, with the caution that the high rate of claims to volunteering and training is based on direct and personal contact, as opposed to mass appeals for emergency and disaster volunteers, such as newspaper, radio, and television. It is also suggested that public policy on training programs needs to involve local communities, and/or solicit their input.

Overall findings indicate a national consensus toward willingness to participate in both training and volunteering activities. The self-help concept is rated, consistently overall, as a "very good" idea. The perceived effectiveness of local programs rated higher than that of Federal programs, across all comparisons.

Data are also analyzed in terms of geographic areas: counties and administrative regions. Demographics and selected background traits are also compared to responses. No significant relationships are found when claims to voluntary activity are compared to geographic areas and demographics.

It is suggested that public policy in this field be directed toward managing a large pool of volunteers, with the caution that the high rate of claims to volunteering and training is based on direct and personal contact, as opposed to mass appeals for emergency and disaster volunteers, such as newspaper, radio, and television. It is also suggested that public policy on training programs needs to involve local communities, and/or solicit their input.

Overall findings indicate a national consensus toward willingness to participate in both training and volunteering activities. The self-help concept is rated, consistently overall, as a "very good" idea. The perceived effectiveness of local programs rated higher than that of Federal programs, across all comparisons.

Data are also analyzed in terms of geographic areas: counties and administrative regions. Demographics and selected background traits are also compared to responses. No significant relationships are found when claims to voluntary activity are compared to geographic areas and demographics.

It is suggested that public policy in this field be directed toward managing a large pool of volunteers, with the caution that the high rate of claims to volunteering and training is based on direct and personal contact, as opposed to mass appeals for emergency and disaster volunteers, such as newspaper, radio, and television. It is also suggested that public policy on training programs needs to involve local communities, and/or solicit their input.

Overall findings indicate a national consensus toward willingness to participate in both training and volunteering activities. The self-help concept is rated, consistently overall, as a "very good" idea. The perceived effectiveness of local programs rated higher than that of Federal programs, across all comparisons.

Data are also analyzed in terms of geographic areas: counties and administrative regions. Demographics and selected background traits are also compared to responses. No significant relationships are found when claims to voluntary activity are compared to geographic areas and demographics.

It is suggested that public policy in this field be directed toward managing a large pool of volunteers, with the caution that the high rate of claims to volunteering and training is based on direct and personal contact, as opposed to mass appeals for emergency and disaster volunteers, such as newspaper, radio, and television. It is also suggested that public policy on training programs needs to involve local communities, and/or solicit their input.